DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 413 117 RC 021 031

AUTHOR	Tierney, William G.
TITLE	Official Encouragement, Institutional Discouragement: Minorities in Academe--The Native American Experience. Interpretive Perspectives on Education and Policy [Series].
ISBN	ISBN-0-89391-829-6
PUB DATE	1992-00-00
NOTE	192p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Ablex Publishing Corp., P.O. Box 5297, Greenwich, CT 06831-0504 (hardback: ISBN-0-89391-829-6, $73.25; paperback: ISBN-0-89391-946-2, $39.50).
PUB TYPE	Books (010) -- Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Persistence; *American Indian Education; *College Students; Colleges; Critical Theory; Dropout Research; *Educational Research; Higher Education; Minority Groups; School Holding Power; Student Adjustment; *Student College Relationship; Student Empowerment; *Student Experience; Tribally Controlled Education
IDENTIFIERS	Critical Ethnography; *Native Americans

ABSTRACT

American Indian students are among the most underrepresent groups in academe, and few of those who enter college finish. This book attempts to provide greater understanding of Native American experiences in higher education through analysis based on critical theory, focusing particularly on the recruitment and retention of Native Americans by postsecondary institutions. At least two stories are told about the challenges and obstacles that Native Americans face in college. The first story, told by traditional research, considers minority retention in higher education as a "problem" that has existed throughout academe's history. Traditional research, such as that of V. Tinto, focuses on student characteristics, the fit between student and institution, and the extent of student integration into the institution's academic and social life. In contrast, this book uses comparative case studies to provide multiple perspectives and to analyze the patterns of American Indian students' experience within the conceptual framework of critical ethnography. Over 20 interviews of students and staff were conducted at 10 postsecondary institutions (including 4 tribal colleges) with sizable Indian enrollments. The voices of Indian students speak of how the world of higher education appears to them, reflecting influences of family, culture, gender, and clas on student experience. The final section analyzes the "culture of power" th exists in academe, discusses rituals of student empowerment, and offers suggestions for constructing alternative forms of authority and a cultural responsive pedagogy that empowers rather than disables. Appendix comments methodology and praxis. Contains 157 references and author and subject indexes. (SV)

ED 413 117

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
B. Bernstein
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

OFFICIAL ENCOURAGEMENT, INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURAGEMENT:

Minorities in Academe- The Native American Experience

William G. Tierney

RC021031

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OFFICIAL ENCOURAGEMENT, INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURAGEMENT:

Minorities in Academe— The Native American Experience

INTERPRETIVE PERSPECTIVES ON EDUCATION AND POLICY

George W. Noblit and William T. Pink, **Series Editors**

Effective Staff Development for School Change, *William T. Pink and Arthur A. Hyde (Eds.)*

Official Encouragement, Institutional Discouragement: Minorities in Academe—The Native American Experience, *William G. Tierney*

The Social Uses of Writing: Politics and Pedagogy, *Thomas Fox*

Struggling with Their Histories: Economic Decline and Educational Improvement in Four Rural Southeastern School Districts, *Alan J. DeYoung*

Testing, Reform, and Rebellion, *H. Dickson Corbett and Bruce L. Wilson*

Towards a Theory and Practice of Teacher Cultural Politics, *Barry Kanpol*

in preparation

Schools as Constructed Systems, *Charles A. Tesconi*

School Cultures: Universes of Meaning in Private Schools, *Mary E. Henry*

OFFICIAL ENCOURAGEMENT, INSTITUTIONAL DISCOURAGEMENT:

Minorities in Academe— The Native American Experience

William G. Tierney

Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

West Virginia Wesleyan College
281510
LIBRARY

ABLEX PUBLISHING CORPORATION
NORWOOD, NEW JERSEY

98

Copyright © 1992 by Ablex Publishing Corporation

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording, or otherwise, without permission of the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Tierny, William G.
Official encouragement, institutional discouragement : minorities in academe—the Native American experience / William G. Tierney.
p. cm.—(Interpretive perspectives on education and policy)
"March, 1991."
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-89391-829-6
1. Indians of North America—Education (Higher) I. Title.
II. Series.
E97.T54 1992
378.1'98297—dc20 92-10048
CIP

Ablex Publishing Corporation
355 Chestnut Street
Norwood, New Jersey 07648

For Bobby Wright

CONTENTS

List of Tables *ix*

The Students *xi*

Part I: Experience and the Nature of Reality *1*

1 The Education of Johnny Ortiz *3*
  Native Americans in Higher Education *8*
  Research Design *12*

2 Students in the Pipeline: Traditional Conceptualizations *17*
  Research on College Students *20*
  Research in Organizations *26*

3 Critical Theory and Rituals of Empowerment *33*
  Theoretical Scaffolding *33*
  A Critical Analysis of the Pipeline *39*
  A Critical Analysis of Rituals of Integration *45*
  Rituals of Empowerment *50*

Part II: The Reality of Dreams *55*

4 Students: Dreaming *57*
  I. Thinking About College *57*
  II. College Life *68*

5 Organizations: Dreams Denied *85*
  Organizational Stratification *86*
  The State Environment *90*

Organizational Contexts 94
Analysis 108

6 Tribal Colleges: Dreams Deferred 115
Contextualizing Tribal Colleges 115

Part III: The Power of the Powerless 135

7 The Politics of Hope 137
Cultural Politics 138
A Politics of Difference 143
Rituals of Empowerment 148

8 Living in Truth 151
Organizations and Their Cultures 152
Culture, Pedagogy, and Learning 160
Conclusion 164

Appendix A: Method and Praxis 167

References 173

Author Index 181

Subject Index 185

LIST OF TABLES

1.1 Persistence in Higher Education by Racial or Ethnic Group **9**
1.2 Percent Enrollment of Racial/Ethnic Groups by Type of Institution, 1986–87 **10**
3.1 Two Approaches to Research on American Indian Undergraduate Student Retention **36**
5.1 Native American and Anglo Attendance in Public, Private, and Tribally Controlled Colleges (TCC) **87**
5.2 College Participation Rates of High School Graduates Immediately Following Graduation, by Socioeconomic Status, Fall 1972 and Fall 1980 **89**
5.3 Educational Resources and Benefits of Different Public Institutions **91**

THE STUDENTS

Johnny Ortiz	High school salutatorian, "father figure" to his niece and nephew, excels in a technical program at a community college.
Angela Smith	College counselor for over 5 years at a tribal college, a tribal member.
Larraine Craft	Straight-A, university science student, received encouragement from an 8th-grade teacher, wants to become teacher.
Becky & Edie	Sisters from Los Angeles, attended public schools together and now attend college together; their parents moved with them to college.
Doreen Begay	Friend of Becky and Edie, 28-year-old student and mother of three, a junior majoring in electrical engineering.
Bruce Crow Flies High	18-year-old freshman, wants to go back to the reservation and do something in solar energy; feels isolated at college, so he goes home most weekends.
Beth Wright	Married student with two children; met her husband while in college several years ago; working on a degree in social work.
John Wright	Beth's husband, working on a degree in microbiology.
Clinton Bennett	Spent most of his life on the reservation until he left for college, wants to be an architect; lives alone and goes home most weekends.

Rose Bird	Born on the reservation but lived in several different locales; went to school away from home, attends college on a track scholarship.
Delbert Thunderwolf	Moved back and forth between the reservation and a large city, attended a boarding school, has no real family.
Sheri Yellowbird	Chose her courses based on location of the class in order to alleviate unfamiliarity and confusion.
Lila Hyden	Drove back and forth 2 hours to attend college while caring for a baby.
Fanny James	Found classes to be rather large, does not speak in class, wants to be a doctor or engineer.
Kenny Gwin	Born and raised on the reservation, left for college to acquire an employable skill, 29 years old and married, has a daughter.

Part I

Experience and the Nature of Reality

Native Americans are one of the smallest ethnic minorities of the United States population, and American Indian students are among the most underrepresented groups in academe. In part, because of both of these factors there is little research about Native American undergraduate experiences in higher education. Gross generalities exist—close to 85% of those students who enter academe will not finish, for example—but few studies have offered either a theoretical discussion of the challenges these students face or an in-depth portrait of what those challenges are. This book is an attempt to provide greater understanding of Native American experiences in higher education through an analysis based on critical theory. Particular emphasis is placed on the recruitment and retention of Native Americans to postsecondary institutions.

In Chapter 1 the structure of the book is sketched, and a discussion ensues about the current literature on Native Americans in postsecondary education. Chapter 2 offers an overview of how traditional researchers have conceived of student departure. The work of Vincent Tinto receives attention, and the theoretical underpinnings of traditional research are discussed. Chapter 3 provides an alternative to traditional research. The chapter outlines critical theory, points out its areas of disagreement with traditional research and Tinto's work in particular, and offers an alternative framework for analyzing data in this book. The chapter emphasizes the ontological differences between traditional and critical notions of reality, which in turn influence epistemological and methodological choices.

Chapter 1

The Education of Johnny Ortiz

It was Sunday, and Johnny Ortiz sat home watching a football game on television. A van pulled up to the house; three women got out, walked to the front door, and asked to speak with Johnny. Johnny later reflected:

> It all happened so fast. They told me that the tribe had some money for me to go to college, and they asked me if I wanted to go.

He thought for a few moments and told his dad that he had decided to go to college after all. When Johnny graduated from high school 12 months earlier, everyone had encouraged him to go straight to college—his mother, his father, his high school counselor. "They wanted me to go to the university and study science," he recalled, "but I stayed home. I worked construction with my father and earned some money."

Johnny had been salutatorian of his class. Prior to high school graduation he had tasted college through a summer Upward Bound program when he was a junior. "It was a good experience. A lot of us went to the university in the program. We got to see what college was like. We lived in the dorms and took some classes. I did pretty good in math." Johnny took pride in being good in math, yet as his class standing reflected, he had been a good student overall. In addition to his academic ranking, he also had lettered in basketball and football. "I was a real jock," he noted.

Johnny's decision to stay home after high school graduation was based on family ties. His parents had divorced when he was quite young, and his four older brothers and sisters all lived on the reservation. None of them had gone to college. He was particularly close to his older sister, who was a single parent of two children under the age of 5. When Johnny was in high school his sister left the children with his mother. "I'm like a father figure to them," he said with some pride. "I became like the man of the house. I took care of them and my mom."

Curiously, his decision to attend college also was based on family ties. As he had hoped, his year of work had provided him with some income. However, he also had grown tired of the daily routine of a job. He was afraid that he would soon wake up and find himself like his older brothers, who worked construction, not because they wanted to, but because they had no other possibilities. He was concerned with "making it" and being able to have options so that he could take care of his nephew and niece.

> When I'm successful I want to raise the kids. I love them. I don't want them to face what I faced when I was a kid. My father was an alcoholic and I saw lots of bad things. It was tough growing up. I want a good job. Maybe a car. I want to show my family that I can do the best. My dad keeps emphasizing it—go to school. He keeps telling me he doesn't want me to end up like he did, working with his hands.

The van that carried Johnny to college held 15 other young men and women from the reservation. Each of them had been approached by the three women who had invited Johnny to go to college. Johnny later found out that the tribe's funding had come through late, and that the tribal administrators were faced with two choices—either locate individuals who could use the money or lose the funding. The tribe sent the women out to find people to fill the spots.

In addition to a stipend and tuition, each student's housing also was provided. All of the students lived in the same apartment building a few blocks from the community college. The school was over a 10-hour drive from the reservation; thus the students spent a lot of time with one another, because they knew no one else in the city. At first Johnny roomed with one fellow from his tribe whom he knew from high school. But as Johnny related, "He went home after a couple of weeks. He didn't like it." After a brief period of living by himself, Johnny found another individual from his tribe who had been living in the area. Johnny was 20 and his roommate was 10 years older than he. "My mom disapproved," Johnny laughed. "She thought he'd get me in trouble. That we'd party too much, drink too much, because he was over-age and could get stuff."

In fact, Johnny reckoned that "partying" had been the demise of most of the people he had ridden with in the van. After 2 years only he and two other individuals were still going to the college. "When we first got here, everybody partied down a lot," Johnny remembered. "Some of them had just come for the ride. Others wanted to be good students, but the counseling wasn't very good, or they got homesick, or it was just too difficult. One by one everybody left." Johnny also had partied, but he confined his "sprees" to the weekend. He said, "During the week I worked hard. But on the weekend, maybe I'd have some beers and pizza. Watch the Raiders or the Suns. Recuperate. Drive around."

At school, Johnny was not sure what he wanted to study when he arrived. The first day at the college Johnny had a meeting with a counselor who gave him a battery of tests. Johnny waited in the lobby and studied the college catalogue while the counselor figured out the scores on the exams. Other than the few moments when the three women had spoken to him about going to the institution, Johnny had not seen or read anything about the college. All Johnny really knew about the school was that all of the expenses would be paid, and that he could learn a particular skill or trade. Eventually the counselor came out of his office and told Johnny that he could take anything he wanted. Evidently, Johnny had done very well on the exams.

> I didn't know what to do, so I just pointed to one and said, "Yeah, I'll do that." Just like that. Right on the spur of the moment. The guy said it was the toughest program and I just said okay, sign me up.

Johnny had pointed to a major in "laser electro-optic technology." Although the counselor who had given Johnny the exams was officially his advisor, Johnny never returned to see him. "I just never went back. I found out stuff on my own," said Johnny. At first, Johnny found the courses difficult. He ended up repeating two classes in math and science. He had been particularly discouraged that he had not done well in mathematics, for that was his strongest subject in high school.

But he persevered and was set to graduate at the end of five semesters. He sat in a corner of the community college cafeteria and thought about what it had taken to graduate, about the future, about what he wanted out of life. He was a handsome young man with straight black hair and dark eyes. He had the build more of a fullback than a basketball player. He sat at the table with his arms folded and spoke quietly, self-assured. He wore a clean white t-shirt, blue jeans, and hightop sneakers. In some respects he was just like countless other college students at countless other colleges. But Johnny Ortiz was not like countless other college students. He offered a summary of his future plans:

> I'm not sure what I want to do when I graduate. Get a job. Take care of my nephew and niece, my mom. I don't think I'll live on the res, for now at least. I suppose someday I'll get a college degree. I know one thing. I'll make it. I want to try to be something.

Johnny Ortiz was not like other college students, because of his race, his ethnicity. Native American college students account for less than 1% of the college-going population in the United States (Mingle, 1987). And of those Native American students who enter postsecondary institutions, estimates range as high as 85% of them will not finish (Birdsell, 1984). Johnny Ortiz, then, was exceptional. He was an Indian student, and he was about to graduate from a postsecondary institution, albeit the least prestigious in academe—a 2-year vocational school.

This book concerns the challenges and obstacles Native American students like Johnny face when they attend college. At least two stories have been told about these challenges and obstacles. Although both stories have similar plots, the morals of their tales are quite different. The plot of both stories concerns minority participation in academe. The first story—the traditional one—considers minority retention in higher education as a "problem" that has existed in one form or another throughout academe's history. First, minorities were not allowed to enter, or they were not academically prepared, or, more recently, they declined to participate. And now minorities cannot be retained. They leave, or drop out, like Johnny's friends.

The traditional story has been very popular. The story tellers have called upon a variety of facts to make their tale plausible. As with any popular story or legend, other stories have been created and other story tellers have arrived to provide their own version and interpretation of the legend. Nevertheless, the structure and moral of the traditional story has remained the same.

The second story is also about minorities in higher education. The facts and numbers used by the first story tellers are also called upon in the second story. Even though the basic plot is similar, the interpretations that the second story tellers give to their tale is quite different from that of the first legend. Rather than view minority retention as a "problem," the second story questions some of the assumptions that undergird the story's plot. Concepts such as *drop-out* are brought into question. Consequently, the structure and morals of both tales are dissimilar.

One may wonder how it is possible to call upon the same facts, to have a similar plot, and to end with such different interpretations. Indeed, the goal of social science research throughout the 20th century has been to replicate the precision of the scientist's laboratory. If researchers are able to assemble the same facts in front of themselves, then they will reach similar conclusions. How is it possible, then, that 90 years worth of facts about minorities have not produced greater similarity of results, indeed, successful outcomes?

Another way to think about this problem of similar plots and different interpretations is by way of creation myths. All people have a story about how they came into existence, how the world was created. Christians believe that God created the heavens and the earth in 7 days. In Genesis, Christians read that God said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." The legend of the Northern Cheyenne, now of Montana, is quite different. In one account the Cheyenne note:

> In the beginning Great Medicine created the earth.... In this beautiful country the Great Medicine put animals, birds, insects, and fish of all kinds. Then he created human beings to live with the other creatures. Every animal, big and small, every bird, big and small, every fish, and every insect could talk to the people and understand them. The people could understand each other, for they had a common language and lived in friendship.... They wandered everywhere among the wild animals, and when night came and they were weary, they lay down on the cool grass and slept. During the days they talked with the other animals, for they were all friends. (Erdoes & Ortiz, 1984, p. 112)

Both tales have similar plots, but the structure of the stories and the morals of the tales are quite different. In Genesis "man" is ruler over the earth, the animals; for the Cheyenne, however, animals, birds, insects, and people "live in friendship." Of consequence, different interpretations and morals lead to different actions. How the White settlers of Montana thought about the earth "and every creeping thing" was very different from the Cheyenne story, for example.

How the traditional "story tellers" think about minorities in higher education is also very different from the narrators of the second tale. This book tells the second story. The book's first part compares and contrasts both stories. In the subsequent chapter, an encapsulated form of the traditional story takes place so that the reader has a point of reference. The reader hears a synopsis of one of the best tales of the traditional kind, Vincent Tinto's (1987) *Leaving College*. The strengths and problems of the traditional story are outlined by utilizing the point of view of the second story tellers. Chapter 3 then provides the structural narrative of the tale that is to be told. Critical theory forms the scaffolding for the narrative.

Part II consists of three chapters. In Chapter 4 other students such as Johnny Ortiz talk about their lives in academe. Occasionally an individual's parents or relatives or teachers also offer their own perceptions about students' college-going patterns. The colleges and universities that these students enter account for Chapter 5. A description of what kinds of programs, struggles, and support Indian students might encounter when they enter mainstream institutions provides the reader with different organizational portraits. Chapter 6 pertains to a specific kind of institution for American Indians—the tribally controlled college. Most of these institutions are no more than 20 years old, and their story is very different from that of mainstream colleges.

The moral of the tale makes up the chapters of Part III. Chapter 7 reunites the theoretical suppositions from Part II. Chapter 8 offers suggestions for institutional participants and discusses an agenda for individual action. Rather than a tale of despair or confusion, the chapters outline a politics of hope.

Prior to beginning the traditional story, however, the reader ought to hear "the facts." Simply stated, if both stories call upon similar data and make different interpretations, then the readers should have those facts so that the stories make more sense. Interpretations also do not come out of thin air; methodological considerations need to be examined. The remainder of this chapter, then, offers the reader an overview of Native American participation in postsecondary education, and the methodology called upon to create this book.

NATIVE AMERICANS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

By all accounts the Native American population of the United States is growing at a fast pace and becoming increasingly youthful. Current estimates place the total population of Native Americans in the United States at slightly less than 2 million. The average age of the population is 16 (Tijerina & Biemer, 1988, p. 88). Native Americans are equally split between those who live in rural and urban areas. One-third live on Indian lands (Bureau of the Census, 1985, p. 7). According to the Bureau of the Census (1985), single parent families maintained by women have risen over the last 20 years—from 18% to 25%—and is 10% greater than that of the total population . Similarly, for American Indians the unemployment rate and those living below the poverty line is greater, and the median family income is less, than that of the total population (Fries, 1987).

Several different surveys suggest that less than 60% of those students who are ninth graders will eventually graduate from high school (Navajo Nation, 1988; Dolman & Kaufman, 1985; Birdsell, 1984; Mingle, 1987). Although estimates are rough, most studies suggest that less than 40% of those students who graduate from high school go on to college (Navajo Nation, 1988; Astin, 1982), and 85% of

Table 1.1. Persistence in Higher Education By Racial or Ethnic Group

	Percentage who:				
Group	Complete High School	Enter College	Complete College	Enter Graduate or Professional School	Complete Graduate or Professional School
Whites	83	38	23	14	8
Blacks	72	29	12	8	4
Chicanos	55	22	7	4	2
Puerto Ricans	55	25	7	4	2
American Indians	55	17	6	4	2

Source: Astin, Alexander W., *Minorities in American higher education*, p.51, 1982, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Reprinted by permission.

them will not receive a 4-year degree. More succinctly, if 100 students enter the ninth grade, 60 of them will graduate from high school and about 20 will enter a postsecondary institution (see Table 1). Of those 20 students, about 3 will receive a 4-year degree. In a recent study of the demographics of Native Americans, Hodgkinson, Hamilton-Outtz, and Obarakpor (1990) argue that a higher percentage of students actually go on to college than reported here; however, the end result remains the same. Using Hodgkinson et al.'s data, less than 10% of those who begin high school will eventually receive a 4-year degree.

In some respects American Indian students are quite similar to their white counterparts. College-bound Indian youth say they intend to major, for example, in Physical Science (25%); Business (20%); Biological Science (20%); Social Science (18%); and Arts and Humanities (10%) (Birdsell, 1984, p. 12); these percentages are comparable to White students' intentions. Similarly, the degree-level goals between Native American and Whites is also comparable, except that slightly more Native Americans than Whites intend to obtain a 2-year training degree or an Associate's degree. Seventeen percent of college-going Native Americans say they want a doctorate, 24% want a master's, 31% desire a bachelor's, 3% want an associate's degree, 6% desire a 2-year training degree, and 18% are undecided. Again, like their White counterparts, most Native Americans attend public institutions.

However, in some areas significant differences do exist between Indian and White students. Sixty percent of the American Indian population attend 2-year institutions, compared to 36% for whites. Forty percent of the college-going population receive degrees from rural institutions, as opposed to 35% for White students (Deskins, 1983, p. 49). From 1976 to 1984 the proportion of Native Americans who enrolled full time had decreased from 62% to 48%. And most obviously,

Table 1.2. Percent Enrollment of Racial/Ethnic Groups By Type of Institution, 1986–87

Institution	Black	American Indian	Asian American	Hispanic	White	Nonresident Alien
2-Year Public	40.6	54.3	44.7	56.3	36.9	23.4
2-Year Private	3.7	3.9	0.8	2.3	2.4	1.8
4-Year Public	39.2	34.3	41.4	31.2	42.3	42.9
4-Year Private	16.5	7.5	13.1	10.2	18.4	31.9
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

SOURCE: Unpublished data: National Center for Education Statistics, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems (1986-87).

Indians are a minority on virtually all college campuses except at the 24 tribally controlled colleges. Only seven 4-year institutions have at least 500 Native Americans in attendance (see Table 1.2).

The composite picture of the Native American population is that they are economically poorer, experience more unemployment, and are less formally educated than the national average. A greater percentage of the population live in rural areas than the rest of the country. More students attend 2-year institutions than 4-year colleges, and more Native American students require financial aid. If traditional predictors for academic success are relied upon, Native American students who enter academe are less prepared than their Anglo counterparts and are less likely to graduate from a postsecondary institution. And indeed, the vast proportion of Native American students neither attend a college nor receive a 4-year degree.

Two points need to be raised about the data presented here. First, researchers must be careful about the interpretations derived from the data. For example, some students who leave high school prior to the twelfth grade ultimately gain their general equivalency degree, so that the high school drop-out rate may be lower than reported. In addition, other students who graduate from high school ultimately attend college years later, so that postsecondary attendance may be higher than documented.

Further, if community colleges are in rural areas and transfer agreements are in place between 2- and 4-year institutions, then there is no cause for alarm about where students go to college. Similarly, if part-time students have the proper financial and social support, then one does not need to worry that a sizeable portion of the sample are part-timers. Most importantly, simply because the population has a smaller proportion of college graduates in its cohort means nothing about the basic intelligence of the individuals under study: a group's educational level does not equate with its intelligence or social and spiritual well-being.

The second point that must be discussed about the data pertains to the reliability of most statistics about Native Americans. Hodgkinson et al. comment, "There are very few data available on how many Native Americans of those who enter college actually graduate" (1990, p. 24). Astin continues in his book, *Minorities in American Higher Education*, by saying that the size of the sample of Native Americans "was often so small as to raise serious questions about the reliability of the results" (1982, p. 23). In a recent report specifically about Native Americans in higher education, Fries states, "Most sample surveys are either too small to produce reliable estimates for American Indians, or Indians are grouped into an 'other' category" (1987, p. 31). Consequently, the precision or accuracy of all but the grossest of estimates— such as how many students graduate from college—must be brought into doubt. However, the focus should not be on whether 7% or 9% of those students who attended college actually graduated; everyone agrees that the percentage is abysmally low. The focus, then, should be on how to improve the situation.

The difficulty surrounding statistical surveys of Native Americans is threefold. First, because Native Americans are a relatively small group, researchers often cannot generate enough of a reliable sample from which to generalize. Second, nearly half of the American Indian population is difficult to survey because they live in some of the most rural and isolated areas of the United States. Third, the diversity of tribal peoples and variety of educational programs defy simple categorization. White high school students in Arizona, for example, have two different avenues open to them. They can either attend a public or private high school. Although different kinds of private and public high schools exist, the demographer has a relatively easy time tracking the students. The state department of education keeps the public information and they have a list of the private high schools in the state that can be easily reached.

Navajo high school students, however, have an additional array of educational choices. In addition to public and private high schools in Arizona, a student may attend a Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) operated school, a "cooperative" public school (operated in conjunction with BIA funding), a contract school (under PL 93-638), a grant school (under PL 100-297), or a boarding school. Navajo students may also reside outside of Arizona in similar kinds of schools.

It is estimated that well over 50% of the Indian population also do not reside on their home reservation. Such diversity highlights the confusion that confronts the researcher. The question remains: How should such data be utilized and interpreted? Given that we know this information, what is one to make of it? What follows is a brief discussion of the methodological choices that exist for researchers, and the design called upon in this book.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Angela Smith had been a counselor at the tribal college for over 5 years. She was a tribal member. At the end of an almost 2-hour interview she commented:

> When they first asked me to speak with you they gave me that write-up of yours that has your biography and what the project is about. I looked at it and thought, "What makes him think he can do this? What's he know? All those credentials. He thinks he's so smart, but he'll never understand what our students go through, what we're like."

Like Angela Smith, the anthropologist Clifford Geertz (1983) has doubts that any social scientist can fully understand the reality of those people under study. The problem is twofold. First, a significant number of social scientists now argue that all data is interpretive, so that no one will ever grasp the "true" meaning of another's comments. As Rosaldo has commented, "All interpretations are provisional; they are made by positioned subjects who are prepared to know certain things and not others" (1989, p. 8). Geertz, Rosaldo, and others argue that, however knowledgeable researchers may be about those whom they study, however fluent the researcher may be in the language or history of the people, the interpretations that an individual provides will always be incomplete, partial, limited.

Second, the questionnaires or concepts that interviewers, observers, survey researchers, and the like develop are inevitably their own concepts and questionnaires. The categories that researchers create to make sense of respondents' comments are preconceived classifications developed from the researcher's point of view. The point is not simply that those individuals under study may hold different interpretations of similar concepts, but that they may not even conceptualize their terms in a manner akin to the interviewer. Johnny Ortiz, for example, ended his soliloquy by saying, "I want to be something." Inevitably, such a statement renders pictures both in the author's and reader's mind. "Being something," said in the context of a college environment by a student, undoubtedly implies educational success to an individual who holds "all those credentials." Yet that may not be the case for other individuals, or even Johnny Ortiz. Rather, "being something" may have more to do with cultural or familial obligations than with formalized educational processes. The conceptual category of "being," then, may differ from interviewee to interviewer to reader.

The critique that Geertz and Rosaldo offer is not merely methodological; rather, the concern with how a researcher understands those under study, and how one develops questions to study a group, represent epistemological dilemmas that reject positivist notions of research and question the abilities of researchers omnisciently to understand reality. In the next chapter an extended discussion will ensue about the debate concerning positivism and critical theory. For now, however, Angela Smith's concerns need to be addressed. If academic credentials do not lend insight about "what our students go through, what we're like," then how might a research design be developed so that a researcher is better able to come to terms with the conceptual worlds of Native American students? If all interpretation is "provisional," what are the methods one chooses to ensure that the data are trustworthy? As Geertz has observed, simply because researchers no longer believe that they may perform their studies in the sterilized environment of a laboratory does not mean that they should conduct their work in a sewer.

The approach utilized in this book—critical ethnography—is a relatively new theoretical and methodological formulation. MacLeod (1987), McLaughlin (1991), Tierney (1989b), Weis (1985), and Willis (1977), among others, have analyzed educational experiences from a critical perspective. Anderson describes the origins of the approach in the following manner:

> Critical ethnography in the field of education is the result of the following dialectic: On the one hand, critical ethnography has grown out of dissatisfaction with social accounts of "structures" like class, patriarchy, and racism in which real human actors never appear. On the other hand, it has grown out of dissatisfaction with cultural accounts of human actors in which broad structural constraints like class, patriarchy, and racism never appear. (1989, p. 249)

Accordingly, the assumption is that the conceptual categories one develops and the interpretations one provides are necessarily incomplete and provisional; of consequence, survey data that offer preconceived categories and interpretations will be rejected. Instead, some form of analytic tool must be called upon that will allow informants the ability to develop their own categories and will offer the researcher the ability to present data in a fashion so that readers might develop their own interpretations. Rather than a singular analysis that offers one perspective, the attempt called for here is to develop multiple perspectives. "Processual analysis," Rosaldo notes, "emphasizes that culture requires study from a number of perspectives, and that these perspectives cannot necessarily be added together into a unified summation" (1989, p. 93). Thus, according to critical methodologists, analytic categories are not viewed as singular and holistic, but instead the categories themselves are deconstructed in order to come to terms with their ideological and political aspects.

From a critical perspective the researcher assumes that the research process and all cultures are circumscribed by relations of power and ideology. Researchers are not detached observers and social analysis is not a neutral medium that advances objective thought. The challenge for the researcher is to understand how power operates within a cultural system and to suggest what the conditions of empowerment might be for all those involved in the research process. McDermott is helpful here in explaining the purpose of critical ethnography:

> Doing ethnography inside one's own culture apparently commits a person to the study of phenomena which, upon analysis, seem to disappear. I once tried to study and explain school failure. The sentiments that brought me to that problem remain in hand, but the problem is not what I had thought.... We must protect ourselves constantly against accepting our culture's own definition of its problem and study instead the problems of the people as those problems are organized in the institutional lives of the people with each other.... Every study must be directed by a vision of change and renewal. (1987, p. 364)

To study the educational experiences of Native American students, then, researchers continually refine and alter the questions and categories with which they began. Many voices exist about Native American participation in academe, and the struggle for the researcher is to incorporate these voices into the research design, to make sense of the various perspectives that are discussed, and to provide enough "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) so that readers are able to agree or disagree with the author's analysis of the data.

To develop as comprehensive a picture as possible of the American Indian undergraduate experience in academe, this project employed a longitudinal design that extended over 2 years. During the first year of the project, four tribally controlled colleges and four universities constituted the research sites. In addition to return visits to the initial sites, in the second year another public university, a public community college, and two state agencies afforded new insights. The 10 institutions were located throughout the United States and had in common a sizeable proportion of Native American students on their campuses.

By the end of the research process slightly over 200 interviews had been conducted. The individuals came from various organizational constituencies—administrators, faculty, staff, students, and policy analysts—to name but a few such audiences. Each institution received two visits. The visits involved interviews as well as observations and analysis of historical records that pertained to organizational aspects of Native American participation in the institution.

As noted, critical ethnography is a relatively new undertaking. Consequently, only over the last decade have researchers outlined specific procedures to ensure that the data are trustworthy. In addition to the more accepted forms of qualitative research activities, Lather (1986a, b), Acker, Barry, and Esseveld (1983), Simon and Dippo (1986), and Lincoln and Guba (1985), among others, have delineated a plethora of standardized activities, such as triangulation, member checking, and catalytic and construct validity, with which to judge critical ethnographies. Appendix A offers a more detailed description of the approaches taken to gather the data and the techniques called upon to ensure data trustworthiness.

Prior to turning to a discussion of the traditional and critical approaches to student participation in academe, the parameters of the project will be outlined. This book neither provides a history of Native American education nor offers an analysis of other Native American constituencies such as graduate students or faculty. On the one hand, Native American educational histories have been adequately developed by previous authors (Szasz, 1977; French, 1987; B. Wright, 1988, forthcoming). On the other hand, although Native American graduate students and faculty were interviewed, their thoughts concerned undergraduate life. Thus, this book offers an analysis of the undergraduate college-going patterns of contemporary American Indian students from a critical perspective. Finally, although the concepts and framework for the project derives from critical ethnography, the methodology employed is comparative case studies rather than a single ethnography.

Chapter 2

Students in the Pipeline: Traditional Conceptualizations

The senior administrator had worked at the university for over a dozen years. During that time a variety of reports had come across his desk about the problem of Native American retention and possible solutions for solving the problem. He reflected that, on a grand scale, the solutions either had not been implemented or they had failed. To be sure, small successes occurred with a particular program or with an individual student, but nonetheless the problem remained: Native American students still left the university in droves. Over the years the university's tracking of all student departures had improved, although it was still not adequate. Computers afforded a level of sophistication that was impossible when the administrator had first entered academe. However, computer programs and software cost money that the university could not easily spare. At the same time, university officials now knew gross statistics: more Indian students left in their freshman year than at any other time, many within the first 10 weeks of the semester; in addition, over a 4-year time horizon, the number of Indian students who graduated with a BA could be counted on two hands.

Part of the problem, the administrator reckoned, was poor schooling. Students came ill-prepared for college academically, and the university was not able to meet their deficiencies with the kinds of activities they needed. Indeed, the administrator was not actually sure what activities were required. Like other universities, his institution offered remedial classes in English and math, but these kinds of classes did not seem to work. The problem was tougher than that. He reflected:

> If it was just a matter of them taking a class so they could get up to par, you'd think it would be easy enough. They could do it and we could afford

> to offer the classes. In fact, we do offer those kinds of classes. And don't get me wrong, some of them do take an English 100 class and then they do OK. But the problem's bigger than that. The major problem is that they have a foot in each culture that draws them back to their roots. They are drawn back to their own culture and it's a difficult transition to make. It's a real problem that's not easy for us to solve.

Another administrator called upon a popular phrase—*the pipeline*—and spoke of how it was *leaky*. "We lose students everywhere," he said. "Not enough of them get in the pipeline to begin with, and then those that do get in, drip out here and there so almost nobody gets through." In the 1980s the metaphor of an educational pipeline had gained currency. From this perspective, higher education was a funnel that individuals passed through. As the administrator noted, the problem was not only that people leaked out once they entered the funnel, but also that too few individuals entered the pipeline.

The problem, then, was twofold, "double jeopardy," one individual claimed. On the one hand, many individuals, particularly state officials, felt that not enough Indian students were recruited for college, and pressure was periodically placed on the institution to increase their recruitment efforts. On the other hand, if those students who were recruited were not academically prepared, they would drop out, leak out, of the pipeline. "The best students we won't get," commented one individual. "The top two or three students from a high school will get offers from all over. So we recruit students to increase our numbers, but when they get here, they face the same problems as all their other friends before them. They're not prepared, they can't handle it, and they leave." Naturally, the problem seemed to revolve around recruitment and retention policies and strategies. Summarized one individual, "Not enough come. Too many leave. That's what we know. We don't know how to change it."

Based on what criteria should an institution recruit American Indian students? What kind of programs should be developed that successfully attract students to the institution? Once students have entered college, what does the student need to know to survive, to graduate? What must an institution do to ensure survival and graduation?

Such questions have been asked in academe for over 200 years. These questions originally did not pertain to Native Americans, for by and large, either American Indians were not allowed into academe, or they rejected offers to go to college (B. Wright, forthcoming; Wright & Tierney, 1991). However, underprepared students have been a part of the American collegiate landscape since the 17th century (Tomlinson, 1989, p. 1). The University of Michigan, Vassar College, and Cornell

University are examples of the kinds of institutions that had students with academic deficiencies at the turn of the 20th century. In a study of developmental programming Tomlinson pointed out, "By 1907, more than 50 percent of the students entering Harvard, Yale, Columbia and Princeton could not meet admission standards, and by 1915 courses had been established to address underpreparedness at 350 colleges in the nation" (1989, p.2). Clearly, student departure because of academic deficiencies has historical roots and is not confined to Native American students. Yet some cadres of students and some types of institutions no longer have such problems with the academic pipeline. Harvard and Yale, for example, no longer have trouble retaining students, and traditionally aged White students who attend Columbia or Princeton drop out far less frequently than students from other races who attend state institutions. The question thus turns on student type and organizational fit.

Traditional lines of inquiry have investigated either the students themselves or the organizations students attend in order to develop answers to the questions raised above. Researchers have tried to understand different aspects and variables that pertain to college going and persistence, so that accurate predictions can be made about the chances someone has of graduating, and what needs to be done to fix the problem.

Obviously, student life takes place in an institutional setting. The pipeline itself either can be a portrait of the universe of postsecondary institutions or a picture of a specific postsecondary organization. Traditional researchers have conceived of colleges and universities from a particular viewpoint and researchers have struggled to arrive at answers about what organizational components need to be changed or added so that more students enter the pipeline and do not leak out.

Accordingly, this chapter divides into two sections. The first section offers an overview of previous research efforts on student college-going patterns. In particular, the work of one theorist, Vincent Tinto, receives attention. Tinto has developed a model of academic and social integration with regard to student persistence in 4-year institutions.

The second section discusses how researchers have conceived of postsecondary organizations by drawing on the literature from organizational theory. The section also will discuss another stop in the pipeline, namely, 2-year institutions. One of the assumptions that naturally falls out from the literature on students and on organizations is that colleges and universities may not be the best providers for students who are ill-prepared for the social and academic rigors of academe. Perhaps 2-year institutions are better suited for the underprepared? Once the underprepared are prepared, the thinking goes, they will be able to move successfully along in the pipeline. For such movement to occur, however, agreements need to be put in place between 2- and 4-year institutions, and students need to utilize those agreements.

The purpose in offering an overview of previous research efforts about students and about organizations is to delineate the theoretical notions and policy implications of such views. Simply stated, attempts to answer the problems about Indian students that the administrators above commented on derive from the epistemological assumptions of their questions. The questions one asks imply particular answers. In this chapter the questions and policy-related answers that have been developed will be suggested.

RESEARCH ON COLLEGE STUDENTS

The work of Alexander Astin will be the key point of departure for understanding the literature on student leave-taking from college. Although research on attrition in postsecondary education has been conducted throughout most of the 20th century, and research on dropouts in elementary and secondary education has a variety of different theoretical, epistemological, and methodological foci, most of the current research on student departure in postsecondary education is quite similar in theoretical orientation. As Stage (1990, p. 249) noted in a recent review of the literature on college students, Feldman and Newcomb's *The Impact of College on Students* (1973) and Astin's *Four Critical Years* (1977) stand as "landmarks." Although researchers have tested and challenged different variables that the authors suggested led to attrition, the implicit theoretical and epistemological underpinnings of both "landmarks" have not been brought into question. Indeed, one may point to them as landmarks because of the strength of their argument. Astin's book has gained particular use by current researchers as they struggled to develop the root causes for departure from academe.

Astin identified 52 variables that pertained to student characteristics that he argued could be used to predict college attrition. He based his work on data gathered from the general student population at hundreds of colleges and universities. Astin grouped student characteristics into six categories: (a) academic background and ability, (b) family background, (c) educational aspirations, (d) study habits, (e) expectations about college, and (f) other student characteristics. He measured academic background and ability by average high school grades, rank in high school, college admissions test scores, and students' academic rating of the high school. He found that higher grades, rank, scores, and ratings were positively related to persistence.

Characteristics related to educational aspiration were based on the highest degree expected to be earned and the field of study chosen. Astin found that the higher aspirations one had, the more likely the individual persisted. Expectations about college that served as predictors included self-predictions about persistence, transfer, and plans to get married while in college. Study habits also related to persistence. Astin worked from the assumption that the ability to complete assignments on time, to plan study schedules, and to be self-critical were characteristics of a persister. Conversely, Astin found that study habits related to attrition were complaints of boredom, difficulty concentrating on tasks, failure to complete assignments on time, and maintenance of a neat study area.

Other variables related to attrition included age and marital status at time of matriculation. Based on work by Trent and Medsker (1968) and his own analysis, Astin concluded that older students, particularly women, were more likely to drop out than traditionally aged students. Women who were married when they entered academe had a significantly greater chance of dropping out than their single counterparts. Among all first-year females, for example, those who either were married or had marriage plans were more likely to drop out. However, among male freshmen, being married at the time of college entrance was positively related to persistence.

Astin reported that three types of campus experiences were related to persistence: residence status, academic achievement, and extracurricular activity. A student who lived in the dormitory was more likely to persist. Most importantly, a student's undergraduate grade-point average was more closely related to persistence than any other variable. Participation in extracurricular activities such as athletics or fraternities and sororities also were positively related to persistence.

Astin reported that the type of institution a student chose to attend could be significantly related to students' chances of persisting. He observed that the fit or match between student and institution could enhance persistence if the social background of the student matched with the social backgrounds of other students.

According to Astin, the freshmen least likely to persist were those with poor academic records in high school, low aspirations, poor study habits, relatively uneducated parents, and small-town backgrounds. He stated a pattern that maximized chances of persistence included attendance at either a private university or public 4-year college, living on campus, having a part-time job on campus, membership or participation in extracurricular activities, deferring marriage, and attaining the best grades possible. All of the various factors students brought with them to college obviously could influence their ability to interact with the individuals and environment encountered in the college or university.

Spady (1970, 1971) was one of the first researchers to attempt to develop a theoretical model of the undergraduate dropout process. Derived from a study of first-year students at the University of Chicago, Spady concluded that the dropout process was based on an interaction of several of the variables that Astin also uncovered such as family background, academic potential, and grade performance. Spady synthesized these different variables and created a model that explained student departure from college by utilizing Durkheimian concepts of social integration and anomie.

In essence, Spady argued that it was essential for students to become integrated into the fabric of a postsecondary institution for persistence to occur. Rather than assume the successful integration of students into an institution, Spady viewed social integration as problematic. All of the various factors students brought with them to college had possible influences on the experiences they encountered during the college years. According to Spady, to fully integrate into the life of the institution, students had to be in congruence with both the social and academic systems of the college or university.

Building on Spady's work, Vincent Tinto (1975, 1982, 1987) developed a model of academic and social integration that has become the theoretical foundation for most work on college students and persistence. Again, although a variety of different theoretical models exist with regard to student departure in the lower grade levels, Tinto's theory has served as the basis for virtually all current research in higher education. The challenge that Tinto laid out for himself was to develop a theoretical understanding of why students leave college. Given the work of Feldman and Newcomb, Astin, Spady, and others, researchers knew that different variables lead in some form to student departure. How might those variables be conceptualized into a theoretical formulation?

Tinto's hope has been that researchers eventually will arrive at what Merton has called *grand theory*. That day has not yet arrived. As Tinto has observed, "We remain in the middle range where our theoretical models serve to explain only a portion of the wide range of behaviors that constitute the universe of social interactions" (1982, p. 688). Nevertheless, Tinto's model has advanced the discussion from one of understanding isolated variables to one of developing causal models.

In his widely respected book *Leaving College*, Tinto (1987) explained his theory by calling upon two concepts: (a) Van Gennep's rituals of passage, and (b) Durkheim's theory about suicide and the need for social integration. To summarize these two concepts, Van Gennep assumed that members of a society underwent a variety of rituals throughout their lives that moved them from one stage to another—from childhood to adolescence, from adolescence to adulthood, and so on. Durkheim postulated that the cause of suicide in society was due to the lack of an individual's integration with the larger societal structures such as the church, the state, and the family.

Tinto argued that college life implies a passage from one stage to another, and that college going depends upon how well the college can integrate the student into the social and academic life of the institution. He stated:

> [The model] argues that some degree of social and intellectual integration must exist as a condition for continued persistence. It states that the absence of some form of social and intellectual membership in the academic and social communities of the college serves to establish the condition of departure from the institution. (1987, p. 119)

Thus, Tinto suggested that other factors being equal, the fit between an institution's characteristics and those of the individual form the basis for college persistence. The implication, then, is that the more committed an institution and a student are toward completion, the more likely the student will persist.

A student's commitment results from the ability of the student to become integrated in the academic and social culture of the institution. Both kinds of integration—academic and social—have different variables attributed to them. Academic performance, and interactions with faculty and staff, for example, pertain to academic integration. Participation in out-of-class experiences is related to social integration. Tinto stressed that both academic and social integration are influenced by a student's precollege goals and commitment. Again, as with Astin, family background, high school performance, and the like become variables that help determine how a student will perform in college. All of these variables tie into Tinto's analysis that the college, the pipeline, is a ritual of transition. He elaborates by saying:

> College students are, after all, moving from one community or set of communities, most typically those of the family and local high school, to another, that of the college. Like other persons in the wider society, they too must separate themselves, to some degree, from past associations in

> order to make the transition to eventual incorporation in the life of the college. (1987, p. 94)

In sum, Tinto hypothesized that, when an individual is academically and socially integrated into a college or university, the result is a higher degree of commitment which in turn influences persistence.

Not everyone has concurred with all aspects of Tinto's formulation. Bean and Metzner (1985), for example, criticized social integrationist models from the perspective of "nontraditional" students. Their major concern pertained to the emphasis placed on socialization and integration within the institution. In their analysis, they downplayed the importance of social integration and placed more emphasis on external variables such as background characteristics. Amaury Nora disagreed with Tinto's finding for minority students in a community college. "For Chicano community-college students," he stated, "neither academic integration nor social integration affected retention rates.... Instead, institutional commitments affected student retention" (Nora, 1987, p. 53). Cabrera, Stampen, and Hansen (1990, p. 326) argued with Tinto's lack of analysis of a student's "ability to pay" and concluded that "the higher the SES, the less likely the student was to withdraw."

Although researchers have argued with different aspects of Tinto's model, as noted, his work, like Feldman and Newcomb's and Astin's before it, has been seen as the point of departure for all other current research about student leave-taking. As one scholar noted, "Today few would question that students' commitment, academic integration, and social integration are crucial to their academic success" (Stage, 1990, p. 250). Even Tinto's critics accept the framework that he has offered. In the same article cited above, for example, Cabrera et al. (1990, p. 327) commented, "Our findings conform with the student integration model." In a similar vein, Nora, Attinasi, and Matonak (1990, p. 353) concluded, "The direct, positive effect of academic integration on retention...supported the constructs in Tinto's model. Thus, the vast majority of research that has criticized Tinto's model has explored ways to alter the model with minor adjustments such as the inclusion of variables like "ability to pay."

The assumption running throughout most of the research over the last 20 years is that organizational participants should undertake a variety of activities as they attempt to move students from one stage to another, from one culture to another. Although the variables may change, the theoretical constructs have stayed the same. The assumptions of the model of ritual and social integration are fourfold:

1. Postsecondary institutions are ritualized situations that symbolize movement from one stage of life to another;

2. The movement from one stage of life to another necessitates leaving a previous state and moving into another;
3. Success in postsecondary education demands that the individual becomes successfully integrated into the new society's mores; and
4. Postsecondary institutions serve to synthesize, reproduce, and integrate all of its members toward similar goals.

The point of the analysis, according to Tinto (1989, p. B2), is to improve the educational process. Thus, the purposes of retention efforts, and the implications of understanding a system that enacts rituals of academic and social integration, are "to insure that all students, not just some, have an opportunity to learn as much as possible while they are in college, regardless of whether they decide to stay or leave." In this light, to borrow from the proceeding metaphor, the struggle is to patch the holes in the pipeline so that fewer people drip out, and to be clear about the chances of individuals who enter the pipeline so that they are capable of successfully exiting.

The purpose of such theories, then, is to understand the world and explain it. Tinto and other researchers have tried to come to terms with why students drop out from college, and in doing so, they have accepted that leave-taking, or departure, is natural. Tinto has commented that "it would be foolhardy and counterproductive to believe" (1982, p. 698) that dropouts could be eliminated. He continues:

> It seems unlikely that we will be able to greatly reduce dropouts.... There is much to be said for a system of education that serves to distinguish between those with the competence or interest, motivation, and drive to finish given courses of study, and those who, for a variety of reasons, do not or simply will not seek to complete their programs. (1982, p. 695)

From this perspective departure from an educational institution is seen as natural. To be sure, some students should not depart, and to the extent that inequities or dysfunctions exist, then they should be remedied. But essentially Tinto has tried to point out that student departure from college should not always be viewed in a negative light. Some students leave for good reasons; other students depart because they cannot or do not wish to become integrated into the system. Tinto concludes, "The unavoidable fact is that dropout is as much a reflection of the merits... of the educational system as is persistence. We need ask not whether we should eliminate dropout (since that is not possible) but for which types of students in which types of settings we should act to reduce it" (1982, p. 699). Such a conclusion implies a particular perspective of the "educational system" and its organizations that the ensuing discussion will highlight.

RESEARCH ON ORGANIZATIONS

Unlike the research on student departure from higher education, the research on academic organizations is ontologically and epistemologically diffuse. No consensus exists about what constitutes reality, or how to gain knowledge about it. A wealth of methodologies, theoretical orientations, and interpretations of key concepts characterize the field of organizational theory; even the goal of research investigations is under debate: Is the purpose of research to inform practice or to advance knowledge? The intent of this section is not to enter into that debate; in a book about student leave-taking from academe it would be counterproductive to make a detour into the extensive literature on organizational theory. At the same time, it is imperative to delineate the implicit assumptions researchers concerned with student departure from academe hold about the nature of organizational reality. In doing so, one must also consider how traditional researchers conceive of theory, and how they interpret the structure and function of educational organizations. Thus, what follows is an analysis of theoretical assumptions traditional researchers hold about organizations as they have struggled to come to terms with student departure.

To begin, as Tinto observed above, the challenge for traditional researchers is to build grand theory for making sense of the activities that take place in organizations. The task of the social scientist is to produce a body of knowledge encompassing various hypotheses about administrative life and domains of policy science, which administrators can then in turn either ignore or convert into social action. The assumption of this perspective is that organizational theory makes available to administrators a theoretical basis upon which to decide the best means of achieving certain predetermined goals. Brian Fay is helpful here:

> A policy science is supposed to be a device for organizing political thought in a rational way, merely a method for clarifying empirical relationships among alternative actions and for sorting out their likely consequences, and a procedure for making "correct" decisions; as such, it is supposed to be employable by anyone, regardless of his political views, for any end whatsoever, and its results are supposed to be impartial in the sense of not being dependent upon the particular evaluations of the policy scientist for their truth. (1975, p. 57)

Two dichotomies need to be highlighted. First, as with scientists in a laboratory, traditional researchers believe that a difference exists between facts and values. The social scientist gathers facts—Astin's variables are an example—and values do not enter into the research design. The second dichotomy pertains to observations and interpretations. Again, the social scientist operates from the belief that what he or she observes is a matter of observation and not interpretation. A subsequent researcher, observing the same phenomena, would come to the same conclusion. Research on students, for example, has consistently found that an individual's socioeconomic status has a powerful effect on college persistence. Different researchers have observed the fact, tested it, and found it to be true. Values and interpretations have not entered into the analysis. To be sure, as Cabrera et al. argued, some facts are proven false, so that the theory must be revised. Nevertheless, the social scientist's tools are value-free, replicable, and valid.

From this perspective how one studies organizations takes on a particular slant. For example, one assumption that traditional researchers hold about organizational life is that reality is understandable by participants and researchers, and further, that an ultimate understanding of reality exists. In this light, the organization is a rational, objective, "real" entity which can be objectively studied. The organization is composed of a finite number of elements, structures, and functions; the challenge for researchers is to analyze and test how those parts operate in order to maximize efficiency and effectiveness to achieve the organization's goals. Peterson elaborated by saying that the traditional paradigm

> views organizational elements as objective, accepts them as positive facts, and is concerned with predicting events. The major focus is on structures, observable behaviors and organizational elements. Theories are posed in terms of how one set of variables varies with others and the concern is to test them. The methodologies are primarily reductionist and quantitative in nature. (1985, p. 9)

Thus, research on students in colleges and universities has assumed that organizations exist as objective phenomena, and that the activities that take place within (and outside) academic organizations can be used to explain student departure. Most of the research cited above has used primarily statistical measures or other forms of analysis based on survey data of attitudes and perceptions, or on indicators of individual and institutional characteristics. The assumption is that, if one correctly understands the causal relationships of student leave-taking, then administrators can manage or intentionally direct the organization so that student movement through the pipeline is more effective and efficient.

From this perspective "the organization" takes on a life of its own; it has an ontological reality irrespective of human interpretation or values. And those individuals who populate organizations are capable of willful direction and change. In short, administration is a science. It is possible for social scientists to provide usable knowledge to administrators so that they are able to manage and control the organization in much the same manner as natural scientists are capable of enabling individuals to control and manage natural phenomena. The hallmark of decision making in an organization, then, is its impartiality. Decision makers are capable of collecting perfect information and making decisions that are value-free.

Obviously, such a description of an organization is a portrait of an ideal world. Few administrators or traditionally minded researchers would contend that their analyses culminate in perfect information or decisions. Likewise, examples abound about how decision making often becomes political and subjective. Regardless, it is important to point out how traditional researchers conceive of the world. Imperfect information can be overcome, and political or subjective decisions are wrong. Essentially, decision makers are capable of making informed, objective decisions; the task of the researcher is to provide the data so that such decisions will be made.

At this point it will be helpful to consider how traditional researchers perceive of concepts such as conflict, power, and knowledge. Is an organization a smoothly running system where conflict is an aberration? How does power affect decision making? How is knowledge defined? As the next chapter will demonstrate, each concept is a crucial point of departure between how traditional and critical researchers conceive of the organization, and hence, student departure.

Traditional researchers assume that conflict is unnecessary and that it can be resolved if all stakeholders have the requisite data. Conflict in a system is a disturbance, an eruption, that should not occur. It is helpful to return to Tinto's model of academic and social integration here in order to portray how traditional researchers conceive of conflict. Tinto speaks of educational organizations in the following manner: "Our model of institutional departure is also a model of educational communities. It is a view of the educational process which emphasizes the role of social and intellectual communities in the shaping of student life" (1987, p. 128).

The core of a community is the unity of its ontological outlook. A *community*, as defined by the *Oxford Etymological Dictionary*, is a body of people associated by common status, pursuits, and common character. Again, one should not overdraw the definition; to be sure, disagreements and minor disputes occur. The controversies of a community, however, are not about the mission or purpose of the community. Generally, there is an implicit agreement among a community's members about ontology. Tinto's argument is that the same kind of communal purpose should exist for educational organizations. Hence, conflict is an organizational aberration.

Power in organizations is viewed as a function of authority. Power is legitimated by communal purpose and invested in particular individuals. French and Raven (1959) and Etzioni (1961) are examples of authors who have equated power with structural and functional aspects of an organization. Either power is a function of a particular role, such as a college president, or power is a structural component that pertains to the manner with which rewards, resources, sanctions, and the like are dealt with in the organization. One examines organizations, then, as structures which exist to solve particular problems and achieve certain goals. Further, if the assumption is that organizations are finite and comprehensible, how participants within organizations define what takes place, then what counts for knowledge is also mutually understandable and communicable. Knowledge is the accumulation of facts and is value-neutral.

Assumptions about conflict, power, and knowledge have important consequences for all studies of organizations, but such assumptions are particularly germane for discussions about educational organizations, in general, and integrative models of student persistence, in particular. One necessarily needs to ask how traditional researchers conceive of education. To answer the question, it will be helpful to reiterate the basic assumptions about research on organizational life:

1. Research is value-neutral, objective, and in search of rule-governing generalizations.
2. Organizations exist as communities that are comprehensible to all who study them.
3. Management is a science that can be informed by causal models of particular problems.
4. Because an organization is a community, conflict is an aberration, power exists as a function of legitimated roles and relationships, and knowledge is mutually understood.

Educational organizations then function around common interpretations of what counts as knowledge. Power resides in positions such as presidents and provosts, and because of their position, their role is to resolve problems such as student departures. Researchers are capable of understanding the activities that take place within an organization, and, with adequate study, are able to offer solutions about what kinds of activities administrators must put in place to control different organizational dilemmas. Logically, education is seen as a socializing process; indeed, Tinto's theory speaks of college going as a ritual of transition which socializes the inductees into new roles in society. Building on Codd (1989, p. 161), the educational significance of such a view is fourfold:

1. Education is concerned with creating people who can function effectively in the community;
2. Education provides skills, beliefs, and attitudes required to become integrated within the community;
3. The power of the community, the majority, governs organizational beliefs; and
4. The goals of education are presupposed and unquestioned.

Following these assumptions, researchers concerned with student departure have offered suggestions about how to solve what is essentially an organizational problem. "Departure," concludes Tinto, "mirrors the absence of social and intellectual integration into the mainstream of community life" (1987, p. 180). From his and others' work, the conclusion is that individuals depart because they are not successfully integrated into academe; through different statistical analyses, causal relationships have been found that point to different aspects that increase or decrease communal affiliation and bonds of socialization. Suggestions such as increasing faculty-student interaction, offering more extracurricular activities, and the like naturally follow from the work of traditional researchers.

At the same time, the admonition from Tinto that concluded the previous section ought to be reiterated: student dropout is a problem that can be improved but not eliminated. Some students depart from college unnecessarily, and they should be integrated. Other students depart from a community where they did not belong, and they should be afforded the opportunity to fit into academic communities where they belong. And still other students depart from communities because they lack the desire to stay, and their departure should not be thought of as a failure either on the student's or community's behalf.

The dilemma of organizational and student fit is of central concern for Native American students and will be discussed at length in Chapters 4 and 5. Traditional researchers have argued that some students are not academically prepared to meet the rigors of university life; academic unpreparedness makes integration into the community difficult. Other students either do not have the financial means or the social desire to attend an institution far from their home or place of employment. One solution is for such students to attend 2-year institutions, to solve their academic deficiencies, and then move to a

4-year institution where they will be better prepared to become fully incorporated members of the community.

The problem, however, is that relatively few students who attend community colleges actually transfer to a 4-year institution and receive their degrees. If organizations are rational entities where processes and structures can be put in place that are understandable to everyone involved, then agreements, bridges, between 2- and 4-year institutions should be implemented. A wealth of studies and information has been developed in this vein (Donovan, Schaier-Peleg, & Forer, 1987, Donovan & Schaier-Peleg, 1988; Pincus & Archer, 1989). The assumption is that educational organizations have similar goals, and as rational entities, agreements can be drawn up, agreed upon, and implemented that will solve the problem of transfer. Once the students have transferred, the 4-year institutions need to develop policies geared toward that specific group's integrative needs. As Tinto has observed, "There is every reason to believe that specially tailored programs will enhance the likelihood that they will finish their degrees in the institution to which they transfer" (1987, p. 163). Thus, as with other organizational dilemmas, intraorganizational problems have rational solutions that can be arrived at through objective analysis.

As noted at the start of the section, organizational theory has a rich array of perspectives about the nature of reality and how it is to be studied. This chapter has discussed student departure and organizational theory from the traditional paradigm. In the next chapter an additional orientation—that of critical theory—will be outlined. How the perspective analyzes student departure from academe also will be discussed. First, however, the chapter will open with the delineation of differences between what has been discussed here—the traditional perspective—and the theoretical orientation used throughout the remainder of the book—the critical perspective.

Chapter 3

Critical Theory and Rituals of Empowerment

The previous chapter sketched how traditional researchers conceive of theory and reality, organizations and education, and student departure and rituals of transition. This chapter offers an alternative explanation for each of those concepts, which in turn will provide the theoretical underpinnings for the remainder of the book. In particular, the chapter emphasizes how each of these concepts pertains to the Native American experience in academe, and in doing so, reorients the discussion about student departure and academic rituals.

THEORETICAL SCAFFOLDING

As noted, traditional researchers think of theory building as a scientific, abstract process, decontextualized from the politics and values that permeate organizational life. The purpose of hypotheses and theories is to understand a particular phenomena, a set of variables, and ultimately, to advance knowledge. To be sure, as with Tinto's model, theory informs practice, but the assumption is that the manner in which theories change practice is value-free and objective. As the scientist created insulin to cure the problem of diabetes, the social scientist develops a theory of student departure to cure the problem of dropouts.

The critical theorist works from a quite different perspective. Critical theory has its roots in the work of the "Frankfurt School" and the work of Adorno, Horkheimer, and Habermas (Tierney, 1991, p. 5). In addition, critical studies of race also draw on the historical work of individuals such as W. E. B. DuBois (1903; Foner, 1970) and C. G. Woodson (1933).

The assumptions of critical theory are that social scientists are embedded in the contexts and structures that they investigate; they are never free from the subjectivities and values that inform their investigation. No one stands removed from the world he or she studies; in effect, no one is an objective observer. Given that perspective, it becomes imperative for researchers to make known their own values and beliefs. For critical theorists, those values and beliefs are related to understanding the oppressive aspects of society in order to transform those features that seek to constrain and silence the oppressed. In essence, if the world is marked by enormous suffering and injustice, then how might a critical theory change those conditions? Henry Giroux explains:

> Theory, in this case, becomes a transformative activity that views itself as explicitly political and commits itself to the projection of a future that is as yet unfulfilled.... Rather than proclaiming a (traditional) notion of neutrality, critical theory openly takes sides in the interest of struggling for a better world. (1983, p. 19)

In doing so, critical theorists reject the idea that an organization exists as a reified, rational object that has a life of its own irrespective of the individuals who populate it. Critical theorists also reject the notion that organizational phenomena can be studied neutrally by the researcher. Instead, the organization is a social construction of society and of the participants within the organization. The role of the critical theorist is to explain the organizational world, criticize it, and empower those who are silenced in order to overthrow it (Fay, 1987, p. 23). In advancing a critical agenda, the theorist argues that theoretical propositions do not simply explain causal relationships of why particular students encounter difficulty when they enter a postsecondary institution. Critical theory offers explanations of the world and how to change it toward a goal based on social justice, emancipation, and empowerment. Thus, with regard to student participation in postsecondary education, the researcher tries to develop theoretical horizons that do not call upon a unitary synthesis as if the organization were a scientific laboratory and everyone's conception of reality were similar. Instead, the critical theorist works to enable the multiple voices that exist among students to be heard. McLaren (1989) is helpful in outlining where such inquiries lead:

> We need to further develop a language of representation and a language of hope which together will allow the subaltern to speak outside the terms and frames of reference provided by the colonizer, whether or not the colonizer in this case happens to be the teacher, the researcher, or the

> administrator. We need a language of analysis and hope that permits women to speak in words outside Name-of-the-Father vocabularies and does not prevent minorities and the excluded to speak their narratives of liberation and desire. We need to provide the marginalized and immiserated with power over the direction of their desiring. The project of critical pedagogy is positioned against a pedantic cult of singularity in which moral authority and theoretical assurance are arrived at unproblematically without regard to the repressed narratives and suffering of the historically disenfranchised. (p. 52)

One should also note that by McLaren's use of the word *we*, he does not mean merely "researchers." A critical approach does not assume that theoreticians develop theory and managers implement practices. Theory is implicit in all activity, whether or not the agents are aware of it. Indeed, a central aspect of critical theory is the belief that one must necessarily unearth the implicit ideologies at work in specific practices, structures, and agencies. In this light, all activity is embedded in theoretical "webs of significance" (Geertz, 1973). Critical theorists try to make those "webs" explicit, while traditional researchers either deny that they exist or believe that they are relatively unimportant with regard to theory building.

The work to make such interrelationships explicit most often involves qualitative research. To attain understandings of how individuals make sense of the world in which they live, critical theorists conduct interviews, participant observations, and a multitude of other qualitative techniques. As opposed to traditional researchers, who assume that they can discover causal relationships from the manipulation of statistical variables, the critical theorist works toward coming to terms with the multiple understandings that exist within an organization. Traditional researchers assume that they stand outside of the research investigation, whereas critical theorists believe that they are involved in sensemaking and knowledge creation. Knowledge, then, is not the accumulation of findings into a cumulative theory; it is a political act that is circumscribed by history, social structure, and the individual interpretations of both the observed and observer. Knowledge is thus tentative and provisional.

The implications of such a view for organizational theory are, logically, quite different from that of traditional researchers. Organizational life and decision making are not rational activities that are fully comprehensible and explainable to the outside researcher. Organizations are not reified objects that have ontological priority over those individuals who populate the institution. Organizations are social constructions invented—and reinvented—by those individuals who exist within them. As Table 3.1 highlights, then, a critical perspective

Table 3.1. Two Approaches to Research on American Indian Undergraduate Student Retention

THEORETICAL FOCUS:	Functionalism: Cultural Integration	Critical theory: Empowerment
PROBLEM:	Student cannot negotiate the collegiate experience effectively	To create the organizational conditions for empowerment
RESEARCH QUESTIONS:	Student centered: Prior academic experience, family support, academic achievement	Institution centered: Nature of curriculum, type of support services, nature of the faculty
CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK:	Student centered: Prior academic experience, family support, academic achievement	Systemic: Highlighting clash between mainstream culture and Indian cultural values and beliefs, tribal goals
METHOD:	Quantitative: Statistical techniques to determine relationships between dependent and independent variables; prediction and explanation	Qualitative: Case studies, ethnographies to intrepret Indian preceptions and views
FINDINGS:	Inadequate academic preparation, lack of motivation, lack of family support and encouragement, lack of financial aid	Lack of societal, institutional commitment to Indian students, lack of relevant coursework and services, cultural alienation
SOLUTIONS:	Better academic preparation, more family support, compensatory programs (counseling, advising), more financial aid	Innovative programs (Indian studies, faculty training and orientation, student orientation and transition), creation of new institutions

offers a fundamentally different way to think about and conduct research in higher education.

One should note that the view advocated here is not that of a hyperindividualism, where organizations are built within the minds of individuals and do not otherwise exist. The argument of critical theorists does not imply that social life can ultimately be reduced to the cognition of individual actors. Organizations are indeed social constructions reinvented as different participants enter and exit. But organizations also exist as societal constructs with unique histories and systems that constrain and enable action. Organizations, social structures, and groups cannot simply be reduced to the aggregation of individual actors.

Organizations are webs within webs; the organization is a web that is lodged in a systemic web that exists along specific temporal and spatial dimensions. To ignore these dimensions and act as if the organization equals the multiple constructions of the participants is to overlook how individuals and organizations are both subjects and objects that build and are constrained by societal forces. Organizations consist of individuals involved in discourses and interactions governed by rules and resources (Foster, 1991, p. 16). These interactions produce and reproduce structure, which in turn determines to some degree how future interactions develop. Giddens offers a helpful summary:

> According to the notion of the duality of structure, the structural properties of social systems are both medium and outcome of the practices they recursively organize. Structure is not "external" to individuals: as memory traces, and as substantiated in social practices, it is in a certain sense more "internal" than exterior to their activities in a Durkheimian sense. Structure is not to be equated with constraint but is always both constraining and enabling. (1984, p. 2)

If there is no ultimate reality of an organization, then the search to control the organization or to develop a science of management becomes fruitless. Inevitably, envisaging an organization in this manner suggests a radically different form than that of the static model of the traditionalists. In the traditionalist view, conflict is an aberration and equilibrium is an organizational goal. Critical theorists assume that conflict is endemic to organizational life, and that an organization in equilibrium implies that the status quo is maintained. Given the power-laden nature of organizations, different individuals and groups will view the world differently, hold different values, and naturally be in conflict with one another. Rather than try to suppress those differences and create a false harmony, critical theorists try to uncover the bases of conflict and expose how power operates to constrain and silence.

Power, and of consequence, knowledge, are also fundamentally different constructs from the manner in which the traditionalists conceive of them. Rather than view each concept as a separate entity, the relationship between power and knowledge that takes place in organizations bounded by space and time forms the core of the critical critique. Knowledge and power are not merely related; they constitute one another. Power creates knowledge and conversely knowledge induces effects of power. Foucault (1980) is helpful in delineating the need for critical conceptions of power/knowledge:

> Mechanisms of power in general have never been much studied by history. History has studied those who held power.... But power in all its strategies, at once general and detailed, and in its mechanisms, has

> never been studied. What has been studied even less is the relation between power and knowledge, the articulation of each other. (1980, p. 51)

Thus, rather than see power as something that exists in a role or structure, the view advanced by critical theorists is that power operates throughout the organization, embodied in discourses and interactions. Power implies that a cluster of relations exist that combine and interact to produce specific actions. As opposed to a focus on individuals, decision making, and overt issues of conflict, the critical view takes into account the inherently political nature of decision making, the overt and covert conflict that exists, and the subjective interests of different constituencies.

For example, a traditional study of racial barriers in education might have looked at how African Americans were denied entrance to schools in a segregated system and advocated legal changes so that those barriers no longer existed. The conflict was overt—racism as evidenced by the denial of entrance to school—and the solution offered sought to end the conflict. A critical study of racism, however, looks more at the institutional processes that deny individuals entrance to academe. The hidden social barriers exist because of factors pertaining to class, race, and gender. Conflict does not need to be overt; implicit in the structure of academe is a system that seeks to exclude some individuals and reward others because of the lack of "cultural capital" (Bourdieu, 1977) or the accumulation of it. *Cultural capital* refers to the sets of linguistic and cultural competencies individuals inherit because of their class, racial, and gender identities. Thus, the critical theorist investigates conflict, not only when someone speaks up because of an overt injustice, but also when there is silence on the part of the dispossessed and voiceless.

Such silence is what Pierre Bourdieu has called "symbolic violence." Individuals do not have to be overtly discriminated against for violence to occur. Those in command operate in a field of power that allows them to impose a definition of the social world that reinforces their interests. The system operates to deny some individuals voice, and their awareness of their lack of voice convinces them either that they have none, or that they want no part of a system that seeks to silence them. Educational institutions, in particular, function to reproduce existing power relations by way of imposing definitions of knowledge that reaffirm the culture of the dominant.

As opposed to conceiving of knowledge as a static entity that all members of a community share, knowledge is viewed as socially produced and legitimated by "mechanisms of power." Knowledge expresses and embodies specific interests and values that privilege some and silence others. Facts no longer can be seen as neutral and theories inevitably take on the interests of a specific constituency, for both facts and theory exist in a web of power that defines what gets chosen as a fact and what questions are asked that lead to theory.

The admittedly abstract nature of critical theory will be lessened if the distinctions between traditional conceptions and the critical view of educational organizations come into focus. To provide the distinctions, it will be helpful to delineate the axioms of critical theory discussed up to this point:

1. All research is value-laden; rulelike generalizations are neither the purpose of research, nor are such generalizations possible.
2. Organizations are made up of individuals who hold competing interpretations of reality.
3. The work of organizational management is a philosophic activity that helps define reality.
4. Conflict naturally exists in organizations; one objective for researchers is to unearth conflict and provide opportunities of voice for the silenced and oppressed.
5. Knowledge is contested terrain circumscribed by influences of power.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE PIPELINE

As noted in the introduction, the metaphors used to portray a situation offer a picture of how researchers view a particular dilemma or problem. The portrait in Genesis of human beings and nature was a quite different picture than the creation stories of the Northern Cheyenne. The pipeline is yet another portrait drawn by a different set of artists—traditional researchers. A critical analysis of this particular portrait is useful, because if the image used as a model to solve a problem, such as minority student recruitment and retention, is flawed, then necessarily the problem will not be solved.

Critical theorists reject an instrumental conception of educational organizations, which is based on the assumption that the manipulation of causal variables can create an efficient solution to a particular problem. Instead, the purpose of theories about educational organizations is to enable individuals to become emancipated and empowered. "The idea behind this conception," states Fay, "is that people are the unwitting victims of processes which cause unnecessary dissatisfaction because they lead people to seek the wrong things and to organize their lives in ways guaranteed to frustrate them" (1987, p. 89). According to critical theorists the point of knowledge is not to learn absolutes, and a knowledgeable individual is not someone who has learned a particular canon of facts and concepts. The point of an education is not to become integrated into a system, but to free people from the constraints of the system itself and enable them to alter it.

The concern with a unitary idea of education is that it appeals to a conception of authority that reinforces the structures and power that exist. A tautology is at work in so far as those who are in power are the individuals who are capable of defining knowledge, yet knowledge defines those who are in power. Those individuals who are dominated or silenced are presumed to be so because they do not possess the knowledge of the knower.

Education thus takes on a fundamentally different purpose for the critical theorist. The processes in which education takes place become important rather than unquestioned. The manner in which activities are done is not merely a means to a particular goal; the processes engender particular meanings, irrespective of the goal. Curricular theorists have spoken of such meanings as the *hidden curriculum*, yet a hidden curriculum exists in all human action. Human activity is invested with multiple meanings, given the social contexts and individual interpretations within which action takes place.

Because multiple meanings exist and knowledge is socially constructed, the power of the majority is constantly brought into question. Rather than see conflict as an aberration that needs a solution that will conform to the will of the majority, conflict is seen as inevitable in any organization, because again, organizations exist through the multiple interpretations of the individuals who reside in them. Simply because one interpretation of an activity or of a definition of knowledge exists in an organization is not reason enough for it to be assumed to be the correct interpretation. The point, then, of education is to subject organizational practices to critical evaluation and scrutiny in order to determine what such activities perpetuate and obscure.

Thus, education's purpose is not simply to socialize the young into the mores of adulthood or to equip them with skills necessary for the world of work. Instead, education takes on the role of enabling people to empower themselves with their own self-understandings of their place in the world, and positioning them so as to change those relationships that constrain and silence them. Critical educators, then, aim to provide the conditions for individuals to become autonomous in the sense that their histories and contexts in which they live are neither obscured nor forgotten. Henry Giroux defines such an educational strategy as "border pedagogy":

> Students must engage knowledge as a border-crosser, as a person moving in and out of borders constructed around coordinates of difference and power. These are not only physical borders, they are cultural borders

> historically constructed and socially organized within maps of rules and regulations that limit and enable particular identities, individual capacities, and social forms. In this case, students cross over into borders of meaning, maps of knowledge, social relations, and values that are increasingly being negotiated and rewritten as the codes and regulations which organize them become destabilized and reshaped. (1988a, p. 7)

Giroux means more than simply that students should be able to understand their own cultures and also exist in others. He does not intend to suggest that educators should be concerned merely with creating the conditions whereupon Native Americans, for example, may appropriate the dominant discourse. Rather, the implications of a critical approach for postsecondary organizations necessitate redefining how to think, and hence act, in the organizational world. D. Wright has commented:

> To understand minority students' development thoroughly requires an examination of social environmental factors, such as economics (especially poverty), ethnic or cultural background, and racial and gender bias and their in[illegible]ctive effects on American society and on minority college students' growth. Current student developmental theories fail to understand these phenomena, yet these environmental factors influence ethnic minorities in significant and often adverse ways. (1987, p.11)

Organizations need to be constructed where minority students' lives are celebrated and affirmed throughout the culture of the institution. The point is not simply to have a Minority Students Center or a course or two devoted to minority issues. Minority students need institutions that create the conditions where the students not only celebrate their own histories but also are helped to examine critically how their lives are shaped and molded by society's forces. Such a theoretical suggestion has implications for virtually all areas of the organization—from how to organize student affairs to the manner in which faculty define knowledge, from the role of assessment to the role of the college president.

The emphasis of a critical analysis shifts away from what strategies those in power can develop to help those not in power, to analyzing how power exists in the organization, and, given how power operates, to developing strategies that seek to transform power relations. Rather than a pipeline where those in power push the powerless through a tunnel, an organization exists as a web where individuals both spin and are caught by the web's gossamer. All organizational participants will be encouraged to come to terms with how they may reconstruct and transform the organization's culture. As opposed to a rhetoric of what mainstream organizations will *do* for minorities—a top-down managerial approach—the struggle for critical theorists is to develop strategies and policies that emerge from a vision of working *with* minorities toward a participatory goal of emancipation and empowerment.

Although critical theorists have been adept at criticizing traditional models of education, we have done less well at offering suggestions for creating the conditions for praxis. Codd, for example, is helpful in describing what a critical pedagogy might be. He states, "Liberating education is problem-posing and results in acts of cognition rather than transferrals of information. It is a form of cultural action that is dialogical and capable of transforming human consciousness from a condition of alienation to a condition of freedom" (1989, p. 175). From Codd's statement one can infer that education is more than just the realization of oppression; it is a permanent critical approach to reality that seeks to uncover the myths that bind and constrain. But what does such a world look like? How does one act in the world?

At least five questions have perplexed students of critical theory which need to be examined: (a) how does one enact critical policies; (b) how are critical policies different from traditional ones; (c) what are those forces that constrain people; (d) if critical theorists implement critical policies in an organization, will conflict cease, power be shared, and knowledge be unitary; and (e) to what extent is a critical agenda appropriated by existing power structures? In large part, the purpose of this book is to attempt to answer those questions; however, an initial observation needs to be sketched about the problems that these questions raise.

In some respects, critical theorists exist in a double-bind. If we reject causal models and assume that reality is multivocal, how can solutions be offered that do not defy the logic upon which they are constructed? From this perspective, the downfall of critical theory is its extreme relativist position. How might policies be developed that administrators follow, if the assumption is that problems need to be defined and solutions suggested at the local level? Do examples exist of critical administrators or faculty other than in the most generalized terms? Who would argue, for example, with Codd's point that education should create "conditions for freedom"?

Giroux comments, "The goals of emancipation are not like a shopping list that one draws up before going to the supermarket, they are goals to be struggled for in specific contexts, under specific historical conditions" (1981, p. 220). Although Giroux's comment is essentially correct—causal models would be logically flawed—one needs to extend his comment. To implement critical policies is to adopt a particular ethic about the nature of organizational interactions and relationships among concepts such as knowledge, power, and conflict. Without concrete examples of what a critical pedagogy or critical administration might look like, critical theory becomes both everything and nothing to individuals who struggle to enact it. Some individuals will claim they are acting in a critical manner when they are doing little more than implementing liberal solutions to conservative problems. Others will search for critical policies but will not be able to come to terms with how one begins to discuss such policies. The suggestion here is that critical theorists offer examples of what they mean by critical theory if a critical argument is to be advanced from abstract theorizing to counterhegemonic praxis.

To be sure, critical theorists need to derive suggestions that are contextualized and take into account the manifold activities that surround a problem or they will fall into the same trap as their liberal counterparts. Any action is embedded in multiple meanings. Consequently, one specific action that might be a critically appropriate response may also be a response that traditional researchers give. Too often stark portraits have been drawn between those who have the "right" answer and those who do not. Utilizing words such as *democracy* or *empowerment* provides those who use them with a certain moral authority or cachet that implies that those who are not critical theorists are antidemocratic, or conversely, that, if individuals are for democracy, then they are critical theorists. Obviously, such a position contradicts the critical agenda. On the one hand, critical theorists reject that any "master narratives" exist, so to position themselves as being in the position to provide a grand narrative would contradict their argument. All individuals—critical theorists included—are caught in the organization's web; to assume that someone is capable of escaping from that web is to deny a fundamental tenet of critical theory itself.

On the other hand, simply because one says he or she is democratic means little. For example, during the 1980s critical educational researchers used the term *empowerment,* yet during the 1984 presidential campaign Ronald Reagan also used the term. In 1988, in one of the more blatant examples of the appropriation of discourse, credit card companies began advertising campaigns that said that they wanted "to empower" customers by issuing credit cards. Obviously, critical theorists, Ronald Reagan, and Diner's Club had different interpretations of what they meant when they used the term *empowerment.* Following the inner logic of critical theory, language and action are always contested. What one must do to comprehend discourse is investigate the practices and social context in which those activities take place.

And when one investigates these practices and contexts one is likely to find that some actions that might be perceived as critical policies are done by those who do not call themselves critical theorists. In educational organizations an example might pertain to the structure of a classroom. By and large, critical theorists often argue for a classroom structure that enables students to respond and interact with one another; yet simply because a teacher creates a classroom where that happens does not mean the teacher is a critical theorist. Conversely, because an individual does not have a classroom where interaction takes place also does not make the individual a villain. If organizational heroes do not exist, villains also are absent. All human activity is caught in an organizational web.

Those forces that account for the organization's web in large part derive from issues of class, race, and gender. As noted, constructs of power in an organization take place within societal histories and contexts. Organizations, whether they be Ivy League schools or tribally controlled colleges, choose students in a myriad of ways that relate to class, race, and gender. To be sure, many blatant examples of bias have lessened in the latter half of the 20th century. Few participants in postsecondary organizations today would readily admit to others or to themselves that they regulate who enters their institution because of the color of students' skin, their social origin, or their gender. Yet surely more implicit actions occur. If one comes from a poor family, that individual is less likely to attend a private 4-year institution and more likely to obtain a 2-year degree. Similarly, if the individual is a woman, she is more likely to study in the humanities than in science or engineering. And most importantly for the purposes of this book, if students are Native Americans, they are more likely to attend a 2-year institution than their Anglo counterparts.

Community colleges, like any organization, take on meanings and significance larger than a range of symbols and discourse intelligible merely to the organization's participants. A critical perspective of community colleges investigates how they serve to reproduce or alter the social order by the activities they conduct for their participants and the nature of their relationship with the wider social order. Again, one cannot merely look at a single activity or teacher in a classroom and organization, and pronounce it transformative or critical. One needs to interrogate where those activities occur and how they relate to the social order in which they reside.

Community colleges, for example, have long held a dual relationship in society. Some observers hold that they are the most democratic of institutions, because they enable individuals who otherwise would not go to college a chance at a postsecondary education (Gleazer, 1968; Medsker & Tillery, 1971). Other individuals have criticized community colleges as organizations that "cool out" the more marginal individuals, and allege that such organizations deny conditions for empowerment (Pincus, 1980; Brint & Karabel, 1989a; Grubb, 1989). In any event, for critical researchers the challenge is to contextualize the actions of a community college or any institution to determine how activities might be changed that enable individuals to become empowered.

Although the purpose of critical investigation is to create change, it would be facile to suggest that a utopian organization exists where issues of class, race, and gender will not influence power, knowledge, and conflict. To assume that conflict can be resolved is to work from an equilibrium model of an organization that denies the constant interplay and interests of individuals and constituencies who continually enter and exit the organization. Indeed, in many respects the role of the transformative intellectual (Giroux, 1988b) is to foment conflict in so far as the lack of conflict implies that people's voices are denied or silenced.

Thus, the portrait of a pipeline is inappropriate for a critical perspective. A smooth-flowing pipeline passes people naturally from one end to another: If a hole exists, all that is needed is for it to be patched up for the pipeline to function effectively. The purpose of research investigations, then, is to discover the holes so that the pipeline can function more efficiently. The critical perspective operates from fundamentally different notions of educational purpose. To highlight these differences specifically with regard to minority recruitment and retention, Tinto's work will again be discussed and analyzed.

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF RITUALS OF INTEGRATION

From a critical perspective the traditional model of student departure from academe raises several questions. Since Tinto's model has a sociocultural framework, and his analysis of education as a ritual of transition is borrowed from the functionalist school of cultural anthropology, it will be helpful to call upon the anthropological literature to examine his model.

Tinto has based his model on the plausible explanation that, if students are neither socially nor academically integrated into the institution, they will leave. Education, viewed as a ritual of transition from one stage to another, necessarily needs to incorporate its inductees into the organization if they are to succeed. The function of education is to socialize individuals to adult roles in society. Activities such as more active student involvement in learning will improve the integrative process, but, according to Tinto, not everyone will become integrated; some students will depart, because they lack the desire to bond to the new community.

Several immediate problems arise with Tinto's use of Van Gennep's rituals of transition for analyzing postsecondary institutions. To begin with, Van Gennep studied traditional societies. Those individuals who were inductees were not inducted into alien societies. For example, a youth from the Navajo tribe underwent a ritual of transition to become an adult Navajo; the transition was one of developmental stages—from adolescence to adulthood. In Tinto's use of transition rituals, he argues that a social institution, a college or university, moves individuals from one stage to another irrespective of culture. The Navajo youth becomes an adult, but the process takes place in an Anglo culture. Presumably, the cultural discontinuity between Navajo and Anglo worlds is unimportant. Oddly, Tinto calls upon an anthropological concept—rituals—yet overlooks the cultural consequences of minority groups such as Native Americans or Hispanics who attend majority institutions.

Institutions and systems—be they schools or political structures—are imbued with cultural and symbolic meanings. Over the last 20 years a wealth of literature has investigated the culture of educational organizations (Greenfield, 1973; Chaffee & Tierney, 1988; Tierney, 1989b; McLaren, 1989; Giroux, 1988a). Obviously, the culture of an organization derives from the larger society in which it resides. A mainstream university will reflect the social and cultural values of the individuals who come from that mainstream. Minorities, by their very definition, will differ in some manner from the majority culture. Consequently, a ritual of transition for minority youths in a majority culture suggests that the students will undergo the ritual in a culture different from their own.

Tinto never takes into account the cultural discontinuities that will occur in his use of Van Gennep's model. For Van Gennep, a rite of passage implied that one had moved through a developmental stage, but that the individual did not move from one culture to another. To be sure, when one moves from a developmental stage such as adolescence to adulthood new symbols are learned, but those symbols derive from a culturally cohesive framework; the ritual did not necessitate that the individual leave his or her own culture. Yet that is precisely what Tinto proposes with an integrative model that downplays conflict and emphasizes unity. Students become academically and socially integrated into a mainstream organization that is based on the dominant culture's symbols, mores, and definitions of knowledge. Because he never discusses the term, one wonders how Tinto defines *integration*. Given his model's implicit assumptions, for cultural minorities how does integration differ from assimilation?

One key problem with Tinto's model is that he has conceptualized rituals from an individualist stance rather than a collective one. In Tinto's analysis individuals attend college, become integrated or do not, graduate or depart. What he has not taken into account are the cultural formations of different groups. Instead, he has assumed that culture exists at a metalevel—all cultures are similar and the culture of the institution merely reflects the culture of society. Obviously this is not the case with regard to minority students who must often confront cultural dissonance when they attend mainstream institutions.

One should not overdraw the distinction between Tinto's meta-analysis and his investigation of minority rates of departure in academe. To be sure, Tinto and other traditional researchers acknowledge that minorities face particular problems when they attend college (Loo & Rolison, 1986; Allen, 1985; Tracy & Sedlacek, 1985). Traditional researchers also have argued that some of these problems are due to the cultural discontinuity between minority and majority culture. Yet the studies, solutions, and, ultimately, the models overlook the culture of groups. Indeed, Tinto's (1987) book *Leaving College* emphasizes the "roots of individual departure" and a "theory of individual departure." From an anthropological standpoint to emphasize "individual" at the expense of the "group" or the "culture" is backwards. Again, what is particularly odd with regard to Tinto's analysis is that he utilizes anthropological terms in an individualist manner.

Further, in tribal societies rituals of transition do not account for terms such as *dropout, failure,* or *departure*. With the best of intentions, Tinto has argued that *dropout* should be used much less frequently, because it has a negative connotation and is inconsistent with traditional researchers' findings about student leave taking from college. *Dropout*, notes Tinto, implies failure and students who leave college do not necessarily fail. Instead, Tinto suggests that researchers use the term *departure,* because it is value-neutral and more in line with rationales for leave taking.

Although one certainly applauds Tinto's struggle to avoid blaming the victim, his choice of terminology reaffirms the traditional assumption that researchers are value-neutral. Tinto persuasively demonstrates that, for the people under study, previous research may have colored the problem with a pejorative language. Yet rather than acknowledge that all language is value-laden and research is subjective, Tinto switches terms. In effect he downplays the epistemological problem he uncovered, and invents what he perceives to be a less pejorative term. The structure, however, remains the same. For one reason or another some students leave college.

Again, from an anthropological standpoint Tinto appears to employ a model that contradicts the role of the researcher/author that he has chosen. In his appeal for a *grand theory* of student leave taking from academe, Tinto has assumed the stance of the objective observer; yet the discipline from which he has derived his model—anthropology—rejects such a detached position. As Rosaldo notes, the researcher "is connected to a community, not isolated and detached" (1989, p. 194). Researchers are "positioned subjects" who understand certain cultural phenomena and not others.

Tinto also never takes into account, or at least never explains to the readers, that he is a "native" studying "native rituals." As a faculty member at a mainstream university he describes processes in which he partakes. The point is not that a native observer's analysis is useless. To the contrary. Native perceptions of the world are essential to understanding that world, but one must necessarily accept that those understandings are provisional, subjective, and never complete. As Edmund Leach has argued, "to understand the word ritual we must take note of the user's background and prejudices" (1968, p. 521).

The need to understand the user's "background and prejudices" reflects the anthropological belief that individuals and groups do not perceive reality in the same fashion. The researcher must come to terms, not only with his or her own preconceived notions of reality and the phenomena under study, but also with those of the individuals who partake in the ritual. In traditional researchers' analyses the vast majority of studies deny voice to those under investigation. How, one wonders, does Tinto's ritual of transition appear to the initiates? In traditional societies the initiates are aware that they are involved in a significant ritual, although their perceptions of the ritual may vary. Are all students aware that they are involved in a significant event when they attend college? Do they all perceive of the ritual similarly? Because Tinto's model does not consider either question, the implicit assumption is that all individuals perceive the world in similar fashion. How they operate in the world will differ—some will depart from school and others will stay—but like their tribal counterparts, all individuals presumably understand that a particular institution is a rite of passage that moves them from one stage to another.

Finally, Tinto's code switching from *dropout* to *departure*, and his lack of analysis of the perceptions of those under study, fail to absorb central anthropological notions of ritual. For example, when one begins a ritual in a tribal society, regardless of the term used, an initiate neither drops out, departs, nor leaves. George and Louise Spindler explain how the Arunta of Australia conceive of initiation rituals, and offer a comparison with educational institutions:

> Despite the onerous nature of the initiation,... all of the young initiates survive the ordeal and are dedicated to seeing that the next class of initiates gets the same treatment. All of the initiates succeed, none fail.... To fail would mean at least that one could not be an Arunta, and

> usually this must mean death as well, but not death at the hands of another, but social death....The whole operation of the initiation school is managed to produce success. To fail to initiate the young successfully is unthinkable. The continuity of culture would be broken and the society would disintegrate. There are no dropouts. (1989, p. 10)

Nor are there "departers." What Tinto has failed to do is investigate the conceptual category upon which he has based his model. He has assumed that student failure, or dropout, or departure, or whatever term he may devise is a universal concept rather than a cultural category embedded in the society of which he is a part. Dropouts exist in modern American schools; the term is absent from Arunta vocabulary as well as that of any number of other tribal societies. The language used to think and talk about students is a cultural construct. Failure exists in postsecondary institutions before students are admitted, enrolled, or take classes. Failure, or leave taking, or departure does not come in the door when the students enter.

The anthropological analysis is relatively straightforward. "Kids in every culture on record learn what has to be learned and do what has to be done to live in their culture," says McDermott. "How then could we have so many of our young unable or unwilling to finish school unless we are in fact...organizing school as a place from which it makes sense to drop out?" (1989, p. 16). Simply stated, human discourse and action are cultural categories; to come to terms with these categories, one must investigate the categories themselves rather than assume that actions such as leaving school are natural and universal.

An anthropological analysis of Tinto's model, then, has two overarching concerns. On the one hand, rituals of transition have never been conceptualized as movements from one culture to another. Van Gennep never assumed that a Navajo youth underwent an initiation ritual in Apache society. Yet Tinto's model assumes that same Navajo youth will undergo a rite of passage in Anglo society. On the other hand, initiation rituals are designed for success. Indeed, in one sense one cannot even say traditional rituals are designed for success, because to say so implies that the opposite—failure—is possible. Tribal cultures assume that an initiation ritual is something all of its young—or a distinct group such as boys or girls—go through. Not to partake of the ritual is unthinkable. Tinto's model assumes that some youths will not desire or be adept at this modern ritual, and that some may leave or fail.

These two concerns highlight the sharp areas of disagreement between traditional and critical researchers. Essentially, these two concerns are ontological in nature. A model of integration that never questions who is to be integrated, and how it is to be done, assumes an individualist stance of human nature and rejects differences based on categories such as class, race, and gender. This discourse of integration is not the voice of minorities speaking for themselves. As Olneck has observed, "It is, rather, the voice of white middle-class education professionals speaking about 'problem' groups and about the solutions to the problems posed by diversity" (1990, p. 163). Although Tinto and other like-minded researchers should be applauded for their attempt to shift the burden of blame for dropouts away from the victims, essentially models of integration have the effect of merely inserting minorities into a dominant cultural frame of reference that is transmitted within dominant cultural forms, leaving invisible cultural hierarchies intact.

If Tinto's analysis is incorrect, what course is left to pursue? Is it possible that postsecondary institutions are initiation rituals, in which case what needs to take place is the transformation of the conceptual category "dropout" or "departer" so that only success occurs? Or is it that one culture can and should never successfully undergo an initiation ritual in another culture? What follows is a discussion of a critical perspective of education and rituals.

RITUALS OF EMPOWERMENT

To speak of culture is to speak of change and evolution. Cultural change neither implies a transition from one culture to another, nor does it suggest that one's conception of the present negates the past. Instead, the struggle in this section—and throughout the book's remainder—is to conceptualize how cultural change and maintenance occur within the confines of a social structure.

Needless to say, all students need to be equipped with the intellectual and vocational skills necessary to function in a postmodern world. Pottinger succinctly elaborates: "While recognizing the importance of cultural traditions few individuals wish to be handicapped by inadequate preparation for the 'real world,' a real world which demands skills relevant to the latest advances in technology. How does one achieve this competence without losing touch with one's heritage?" (1989, p. 3). The question for organizational participants, then, is how to support conditions that help Native American students maintain and develop their cultural identities and simultaneously enable students to acquire "skills relevant to the latest advances in technology."

As demonstrated in the previous section, the inherent assumption underlying much of the traditional research on student departure is that for students to succeed in the "real world" they must acquire the cultural knowledge of that world. This line of reasoning places minorities such as Native Americans at the heart of the problem. Elgin Badwound has observed:

> We are led to the logical conclusion that the problem is the Indian student. The "problem" of Indian student retention is a blessing in disguise; if more Indian students were successful in mainstream undergraduate institutions, this would imply that Indian students were being effectively assimilated into mainstream society. (1989, p.2)

Instead of appropriating the cultural capital of mainstream society, many minority students either decline to participate in higher education, or they resist the dominant ethos at work in white institutions and leave. Yet one is hard pressed to look upon nonparticipation or attrition from postsecondary education as a "success," if the consequences are a student's inability to earn an income or take control of one's life. The struggle, then, is to investigate how organizational participants might develop strategies framed by a concern for redefining the parameters of the organization. Rather than assimilate minorities into the organization, the conditions need to be created where alternative discourses can be heard. Essentially, an organizational culture needs to exist where rituals of empowerment rather than rites of passage will occur. To envision a portrait of what such organizations might look like, a definition of culture, ideology, and empowerment are needed.

The definition of *culture* advanced here is outlined by McLaren as "the particular ways in which a social group lives out and makes sense of its 'given' circumstances and conditions of life" (1989, p. 171). Culture is interpretive, the product of the social and ideological relations in which it is inscribed. From this perspective an organization's culture is neither the sum of its parts nor its symbolic components, as some individuals argue (see Allaire & Firsirotu, 1984). Although cultures have artifacts that are symbolic, the artifacts themselves do not account for culture. For example, a traditional culture such as the Sioux may have a seasonal ceremony to which a particular symbolic significance is ascribed. Yet the culture of the Sioux is not a taxonomic analysis of such symbols, for if it were, culture would be static, neverchanging. Culture is dynamic, never in equilibrium. Similarly, an organization's culture is not the aggregation of particular events such as presidential inaugurations or award ceremonies; such activities reflect aspects of culture, but they do not define it.

The differences in the definitions of culture are essential for understanding the experiences of minority groups in educational institutions and for suggesting what kinds of activities need to take place to improve the lives of minorities in academe. The static model of culture overlooks how change takes place and how culture exists as a product of the social relations of the organization's participants. The critical model of culture struggles to take into account various processes that erupt, intersect, and change on culture's terrain. As Rosaldo notes, culture is a "porous array of intersections where distinct processes crisscross from within and beyond its borders. Such heterogeneous processes often derive from differences of age, gender, class, race, and sexual orientation" (1989, p. 20). Culture, then, is a series of contested areas, discourses, and relations of power that concern the nature of reality; an organization is one of those areas. Educational institutions, in particular, are contested arenas in so far as they exist as a means to define knowledge and what it means to be a knowledgeable individual.

A dominant ideology exists that links an organization's culture to the larger social forces. *Ideology* is the set of doctrines, the framework, through which the organization's participants make sense of their own experiences; *culture* is the manifold ways in which these meanings are enacted (Tierney, 1991). Like culture, ideology is not a grand narrative inherited from generation to generation; instead, it is contested within an organization's culture to the extent that different groups hold oppositional beliefs and practices. Ideologies of educational organizations, then, both reflect and impact the dominant mores of society. Rather than assume that an organization's participants are pawns in a structurally determined situation, the role of human agency must be taken into account in accommodating, mediating, and resisting the dominant logic of an ideology. In essence, the idea advanced here celebrates a dialectical notion of human agency and the possibility for emancipation and empowerment.

The point in mentioning that different groups hold conflicting interpretations of culture and ideology, and that change is possible, is particularly germane with regard to a discussion of minority student leave taking from educational institutions. As noted, Tinto's model considered the roots of *individual* departure, whereas a critical perspective looks at individuals as members of social groups. Such a perspective reorients how one thinks about cultural pluralism and interaction in organizations. "Pluralism must recognize," notes Olneck, "the identities and claims of groups *as groups* and must facilitate, or at least symbolically represent and legitimate collective identity" (1990, p. 148). In doing so an educational organization will need to come to delineate how such activities as pedagogy, curriculum, and modes of assessment are areas of culturally contested terrain. Education becomes a fight, not merely over economic rights, but over the creation of a new symbolic sphere.

Further, the critical perspective also lends understanding to how the category *dropout* is a cultural term. As Moll and Diaz observe, "The key to understanding school performance is not in the study of mental aptitude or attitude toward schooling; it is in understanding the dynamics of material, local settings" (1987, p. 311). Thus, suggestions that a student drops out because he or she is not academically prepared, and the like, seem inadequate as long as the analysis is divorced from the "material local settings" in which they occur.

Logically, if culture is contested and interpreted in different ways, cultural terms such as ritual also will hold different levels of significance for different groups. How, then, might one think of rituals in educational organizations? To begin, a ritual is a form of symbolic action. McLaren elaborates:

> Ritualization is a process which involves the incarnation of symbols, symbol clusters, metaphors, and root paradigms.... As forms of enacted meaning, rituals enable social actors to frame, negotiate, and articulate their phenomenological existence as social, cultural, moral and political beings. (1985, p. 85)

Rituals are never decontextualized from the situations in which they occur, nor do they occur outside of history. As embodiments of culture, they are never neutral, and there is never a singular interpretation of them. On the contrary, they are specific examples of contested arenas on culture's surface. Rituals are not just symbols; they are forms of social interaction that determine meaning. In this light, a ritual is an act of reality construction rather than merely a reflection of a given, determined reality.

Thus, a rite of passage is more than a functional vehicle through which someone passes. The rite helps produce the culture in which it resides. A transition ritual neither contains the "glue" for social cohesion nor does it, as Rosaldo notes, "encapsulate deep cultural wisdom" (1989, p. 20). A rite of passage is little more than a process in a system, a crossroads where life's processes intersect. One should not be surprised, then, in a society that marginalizes and silences particular groups, that those same groups are marginalized and silenced in a rite of passage.

As the ensuing chapters will demonstrate, postsecondary education may be conceived as a rite of passage, but not in the manner Tinto has suggested. Rather than a symbolic process geared toward social integration, rites of passage are intersections where distinct processes come together. Issues such as class, race, gender, and sexual orientation necessitate investigation and analysis. Instead of a pipeline all pass through, the rite is a web that is interwoven and crossed with different processes, goals, and power relations.

The challenge is to turn the rite of passage into one of empowerment based on the multiplicity of voices that exist, rather than based on a singular voice of integration and assimilation. As Shrewsbury has noted, "Empowering strategies allow students to find their own voices, to discover the power of authenticity. They enable individuals to find communion with others and to discover ways to act on their understanding" (1987, p. 9). As opposed to a model of integration, the critical model is one of difference. Yet difference does not need to imply segregation, for difference can enrich a community rather than homogenize everyone.

A ritual of empowerment in an educational setting enables students to critically interrogate and appropriate knowledge as their own. "It also refers to the process," comments McLaren, "by which students learn to question and selectively appropriate those aspects of the dominant culture that will provide them with the basis for defining and transforming, rather than merely serving, the wider social order" (1989, p. 186). Individuals do not empower other individuals irrespective of the specific cultural relations in which they live. Teachers can create the conditions for empowerment, but they cannot heroically transform others. Empowerment is a process of difference; empowered individuals are able to see how the larger society has formed, shaped, and mangled their own lives and interpreted realities.

This chapter has taken issue with traditional conceptions of theory, and of consequence, concepts such as knowledge, power, dropout and ritual. As opposed to a static, integrative model, critical theory offers a dynamic model based on difference. Although postsecondary institutions may be perceived as rites of passage, they are fundamentally different than traditional researchers have conceived of them. A rite of passage is a highly charged intersection where competing interests and groups come together rather than a smoothly flowing corridor through which individuals pass. Rather than a generalized and decontextualized analysis, an account of the world as seen from the margins, as perceived by the voiceless, is provided. And the point of theory, the purpose of analysis, is not to develop yet another grand theory built with objective tools, for no such tools are available. As Nancy Hartsock has commented, "The point is to change the world, not simply to redescribe ourselves or reinterpret the world yet again" (1987, p. 206).

Part II

The Reality of Dreams

Native American students, like all individuals, have dreams. Some individuals have intrinsic dreams for themselves; they want to gain a college degree so they will have a vocation and employment. Others want to become professionals such as doctors or lawyers. Still other students have community-minded hopes; they want to do something that will help their people. And then there are individuals who are unsure of what they want to do, but they want to be happy or near their family, or to live on the reservation. Any number of dreams may pass through a student's mind as he or she begins life in academe. In some respects a dream is the most individual of activities; to be sure, the cognitive work of one's mind is also influenced by the culture and social context in which the person resides, but a human being's dreams appear inherently unique to the dreamer—they are, after all, the individual's hopes, desires, fantasies, and not someone else's.

Yet dreams have a reality to them that involves culture and society. Society influences dreams in any number of ways. Part Two contains three chapters that consider the dreams of Native American students and the way in which society influences those students and their dreams. Chapter 4 contains the voices of Indian students; they speak about how the world of higher education appears to them. The point of this chapter is not to talk about students in general, but rather in particular. Individual voices are not meant to represent all of Native American students in academe as if the portrayal is a world in a teacup, for such an undertaking is impossible. Instead, the chapter's challenge is to portray the various voices uncovered throughout the research endeavor in order to highlight some of the dreams of these students as they set foot on college campuses.

Chapter 5 contains institutional portraits. Individuals have dreams and institutions and state policies influence them. The structure of the institution or a state's policy is often the same for all students; all freshmen register in a particular manner, for example, or all students who have failing grades will receive notices about how the grades have affected their financial aid. Thus, Chapter 4 portrays individual perceptions of mainstream colleges and universities, and Chapter 5 sketches institutional portraits of how institutions and statewide policies structure the experiences of Native Americans.

Chapter 6 considers a particular kind of institution unique for Indian students—tribally controlled colleges. This chapter delineates the unique institutional challenges that these colleges face; the chapter also considers how this institutional world is different from mainstream colleges and universities in how they are organized to serve Indian students and how Indian students perceive them.

Chapter 4

Students: Dreaming

This chapter provides different scenes from Native American students' lives that relate to their dreams, perceptions, and experiences in postsecondary institutions. Depictions from the daily occurrences of students begin with their thoughts about college before they set foot on campus, and continue with their reflections about college after they arrived. In particular, the chapter highlights familial and cultural influences on student experience, and touches on the differential experiences of students based on gender and class. Throughout the chapter, aspects of socialization that students encounter receive emphasis.

The discussion highlights and then analyzes the multitude of experiences students confront and how they deal with those activities. The students come from different tribes and attend different postsecondary institutions. In the ensuing chapter, state policies and specific institutions will be discussed. Thus, the reader first gains an understanding of different students' perceptions of the organizational worlds of academe, and then receives a structural analysis of those worlds.

I. THINKING ABOUT COLLEGE

College Plans

A Native American senior reflected on her 4 years at the college and the dysfunction between the world of higher education and the world from which she had come: "When I was a child I was taught certain things: Don't stand up to your elders, don't question authority, life is precious, the earth is precious, take it slowly, enjoy it. And then you go to college and you learn all these other things, and it never fits."

A second university student commented, "Students don't know what to apply for when they're in high school, what scholarships are available, what's different between one university or another. And even in high school they try to discourage you from the university. They tell you to go to the community college, and you hear stories from your friends that they knew someone who got into trouble at the university, in the city. It's all very confusing."

A third individual, a graduate student, related, "I was a typical mixed up kid at 19. I went to school and I didn't know what I wanted, what I was supposed to do. I just arrived and had nobody to turn to, no understanding of what was expected of me. I raised all sorts of hell the first time I came here, and then I went home because my family needed me, and I didn't come back for a long time."

Each individual highlights some of the difficulties Native American students encounter as they anticipate and then confront the organizational world of higher learning. The first student pointed out the cognitive discrepancies that exist between what she had been taught at home and what she was supposed to learn at school. The second student explained how she had little comprehension of what that foreign world was, and the third individual related what happened when he entered that world. Another student commented:

> I come from a traditional family on the reservation. I went to a high school on the reservation. My parents only went to boarding school, my father didn't graduate. But they told me to go to college. They didn't understand exactly what it was but they thought it was good, that it would help me. They knew it was far away and they didn't mind that as long as I came back for ceremonies. They told me to study hard.

A fifth student spoke in a different manner. She, too, had grown up on the reservation. But rather than encouragement from her parents, she spoke of counsel from a grade-school teacher. "I'm a school type of person," related Larraine Craft. "I've known since the eighth grade I'd go to college. Ever since my teacher told me I should go." Evidently her grammar school teacher kept in contact with her throughout high school and encouraged her to keep studying and apply for a scholarship. "I really loved science and I always got As in school. A counselor in the high school told me to go to a community college, but Mr. Jacobs [the eighth-grade teacher], he said I should go to the university. So he helped me fill out the papers and I got in," stated Larraine.

Two sisters, Becky and Edie, are from a very different family. They grew up in Los Angeles and went to a public high school. They had the following conversation about college:

Becky: We never decided to go to college,

Edie: We just knew, when time came to take the tests, we just did them. We studied for them, with one another and a friend of ours.

Becky: It wasn't much thought. We knew we wanted to come here and we wanted to be together.

Edie: Our mom and dad both went to college, and they didn't say we had to go or anything. It was just sort of assumed. I guess if we didn't want to go we wouldn't of had to, but we wanted to.

Becky: We didn't have any plans, really. It's not like we came here and said, I want to be a doctor or something.

Edie: But we know now. We both like science and business kinds of things. I'm going to work in a Jet Propulsion Laboratory this summer, and Becky wants to do something in finance.

Becky: Eventually get my MBA.

Not surprisingly, then, Indian students come from all walks of life—reservation towns and major cities, and their backgrounds reflect parents who never went to high school and those who hold white collar jobs. Their plans beyond college, however, are a bit more altruistic or family-oriented than those of many of their Anglo counterparts.

The Big Picture

"Sure I know what I want to do," said Bruce Crow Flies High. "I want to go back to the reservation and get involved in solar power and begin a business." A second student also spoke of the reservation: "There's too much politics on the res. I won't work there, but I want to live nearby. I have two sons, and I also don't want them to go to a reservation school, but it's important that they see their grandma, their relatives, learn the traditional ways." A third student agreed: "There's no work for me on the pueblo but I'll live in Mesa [a nearby city]. I like it there. There's Indian people in Mesa, and it's close by."

Two additional students offered different opinions. The first student said, "My tribe has big problems and I want to go back and help them. We need people with college educations, and I can help." The second student had a different idea: "My family's important, my mom and dad, my brothers, but I'll never go back to the reservation. Too many bad memories. I'd get into too much trouble back home. I want to get a good job and live somewhere in a big house so my family can live with me, so I'll take care of them."

John and Beth Wright met when they went to college for the first time. John left college during the first semester but he stayed in town and lived with Beth. Beth eventually became pregnant and quit school for a few years, during which she had two more children. One of those children died in an accident. John left for a year but returned to Beth, and eventually they got married. Six years later John, and then Beth, had returned to the university where they met. Between them they had attended four different institutions: a local community college, a tribal college, another university in the same state, and one university in another state. John was set to graduate with a degree in microbiology, and Beth still had a year to go before she got her degree in social work. She thought she might stop school again for a semester, because she was pregnant and wanted to take it easy. She said:

> What's the big picture for us? John says he wants to go to graduate school. I do too, but not right away. I want to get into osteopathy, but first I want my children to get older. It's been exhausting. Going to school, raising the kids, being without John and then getting used to being with him again. We've moved a lot. My mom's come to live with us so that makes it easier. Things are too busy for us for any sort of big picture like some people probably have. We're a family. I want to stay that way.

Finally, Larraine Craft, the student whose eighth-grade teacher had helped her, also had a comment on her hopes beyond college. "I want to be a teacher," she said. "I want to teach Indian kids. I like children, and I think I'll be a good teacher. I want to teach science or art."

As noted at the outset, although dreams belong to the individual, they are framed in cultural and social constructions. Although one should not assign a causal relationship to a decision to teach school, it surely is not far-fetched to assume that in some manner Larraine's eighth-grade teacher influenced her decision to become a teacher, or that Beth's hope for stability derives from the turbulence of the last few years. At the same time, the argument cannot be made that all students who have a teacher such as Mr. Jacobs will be influenced by him in a manner akin to Larraine, or that all couples desire the stability that John and Beth seek. Yet an individual is related to particular cultural formations, and for native people, those formations often derive from tribal affiliations.

Tribal Influences

In the sense that everyone has a past and lives in community, all individuals have a culture that frames how they see and act in the world. By suggesting that Native Americans often have deep tribal influences, the risk arises of romanticizing Native American culture and people. The intent is not to heroicize American Indian culture and freeze it in a static past so that the reader longs for a time that may never have existed. To speak of culture is to speak of change and evolution.

Further, traditional analyses often appear as if the mainstream has no culture and only those individuals who are minorities have a past that influences their present and determines their future. The most radical of mainstream analyses will then view culture as something that holds individuals from participation in the mainstream. More sympathetic analyses will struggle to view minority culture in an ostensibly neutral fashion. This perspective does not subscribe to the view that culture holds people back; the analysts will take the stance more of 19th century anthropologists trying to understand an exotic culture. Still, by describing a people as exotic and implying that those in the majority are not equally shaped by cultural forces, such analyses maintain an ideology of difference that places minorities at borders, outside of the center. And for as long as they maintain their exotic habits, presumably, minorities will not move from the border. Rosaldo is helpful in discussing the problems that arise with such a view:

> In this view subordinate groups speak in vibrant, fluent ways, but upper middle class people talk like anemic academics. Analysts rarely allow the ratio of class and culture to include power. Thus they conceal the ratio's darker side: the more power one has, the less culture one enjoys, and the more culture one has, the less power one wields.... If "they" have an explicit monopoly on authentic culture, "we" have an unspoken one on institutional power. (1989, p. 202)

From a critical perspective, the challenge is twofold. First, researchers take into account the interplay of culture and power. Second, the need arises to conceptualize how cultural change and maintenance occur concurrently. To do so, one accepts the notion that everyone has influences that frame how he or she sees and acts in the world. The point, then, is not merely to try to be neutral in the analysis of "the other" but to recognize how concepts such as *mainstream* and *center* relegate individuals to particular spatial and geographic locales that inevitably create conditions of power and voice to some and silence and oppression to others.

What follows are four examples of tribal influences. One student, Clinton Bennett, lived on the reservation until he went to college. The second student, Rose Bird, was born on the reservation but lived in several different locales and went to a school away from home. Kenny Gwin, the third student, was born, raised, and worked on the reservation until he decided to go to college to get an employable skill. Finally, Delbert Thunderwolf moved back and forth between the reservation and a large city; he attended a boarding school. Through the minutiae of their everyday existence the reader glimpses cultural backgrounds and influences. The purpose here is to offer a sketch of how students see their recent past and their lives in the present. Such sketches ultimately will afford an understanding of how "mainstream" institutions appear to Indian students, and what actions they take to cope with their existence in an institution where they are a minority. Again, the assumption is that, in some form, their past influences their perceptions of the present. The point is not necessarily to change those students' pasts, but to utilize their perceptions to accommodate their learning in postsecondary institutions.

Clinton Bennett

> I took art in high school and my teacher told me I should do something in design, so I came here. Now I want to be an architect. I'd never been to the city before but my cousin lives here, so I took the bus and when I got here I lived with him. Now I live by myself. I go home every weekend. I take the bus on Friday and then I take it back here on Sunday. It's not too bad. It's about a five hour ride, and then my brother, he meets me and takes me home. We live out in the country.
>
> My father's a farmer. I have four brothers and two sisters. I'm the second oldest. My older brother, he went into the army. He got out last year and now he lives at home. I have a sister and brother who will graduate this year I think. I don't know what they will do.
>
> At first these courses were difficult. I speak [tribal language] so I didn't understand English too good. I learned English when I was young but a lot of the words in my college classes were technical kinds of things so I had to look them up. Me and my friend go the library and look them up. Then we practice them. There's a lot of reading in the courses. I don't speak too much in the courses. Maybe sometimes I'll say something, but if I don't understand something, I'll work it out later. My friend takes the same courses so we figure things out after we're done in class. It works pretty well.
>
> The teachers are good. The ones I like are the ones who make it interesting, who tell jokes or give examples. I don't talk to them much. We have counselors here but I don't see them either. Sometimes it's lonely, there's no one to talk to, but I just tell myself that I want to get through, to graduate. I play basketball to relax and every other day I lift weights. I try to stay out of trouble, not to party around.

Rose Bird

> I went away to high school where there were a lot of white kids. I ran track in school. That was my main interest. I made some friends with

white girls on the track team. I was a good runner! I ran fast. I came to college on a track scholarship.

I think going to a school that had white students helped me here. It wasn't so strange coming here. I missed my family, though, at first. My mom. My older brother also came here, so that was good.

When I was in high school we went home only on vacations, Christmas, things like that and also for the summer. At the summer we went back to the reservation and lived with my grandparents. That was good. The teachers here are better than the ones in high school. They try to help. Some of them also understand that Indian people are different, maybe a little shy. One teacher in particular always asks me how's it going and teases me that I'm going to win an Olympic medal for my running. He's real nice, friendly. But most of them don't say hello. They don't seem sensitive to Indian students' feelings. The students from the reservations are really lost sometimes. I try to help.

I like getting to know people. My girlfriends here are Indian and white. Last year I had a white girl as a roommate but it didn't work out. She and I had different kinds of schedules. She stayed up late. I like to run early in the morning so I wanted to go to bed early. It was a mess! We eventually worked it out but I thought it would be better if I lived with someone different this year, so another girl from my high school and I live together.

I go to the Native American Studies Center a lot and meet other people. When I first came somebody told me about it and I went and met some people and I just come there when I have free time. If I have an hour between classes or maybe at lunch time or if I have some studying to do before I go home I'll go there. There's always people around. It's a friendly place to be.

Kenny Gwin

I'm a full-blooded Indian. I'm studying electronics because I want to try to be a journeyman. I use to be an electrician's helper, but it was in a uranium mine back home. I got laid off and I eventually decided to come here. It's a long story.

I have a daughter and a wife; I'm 29. So one reason I decided for an education is because I feel I have obligations, sort of being like the man in the house. I guess what actually changed things, was that I got into a bad auto accident in '82. I volunteered to work extra hours at the mine to make money. At the mine there's a bar near Cathedral Rock and everybody stopped there. I got into drinking, especially when I worked long hours and one night on the drive home we had an accident. I screwed up my leg so that I was in rehab for a long time. I had time to think because I couldn't work.

Living back home is many things. I miss it when I'm here; I miss family and open space. But there's no jobs, and the temptation is too great. My father and little brother still drink. My brother still works at the mine. I go home a lot, so my daughter can be with her grandma more, but we're pretty settled here for now. My wife likes it here. My father thinks it's good that I decided to get an education.

I came to this town for a year before I applied to school. I worked as a driver, but it wasn't steady. A friend was here and he told me about it. It was hard coming back to school. I got the booklet, applied, and the counselor said I could start. They start you with basic math and English. It starts off easy and then gets tough. Now I'm only taking classes that apply to my trade. I also have a class that tells you how to apply for jobs.

There's not many Indians here; there's maybe three of us in my classes now. I don't really associate with anybody; I take my classes and go home. I'm with my family and a few friends in the apartment where we live. They post what kinds of jobs are available and I'm looking to get out of here by the end of the year. I suppose I'll have a job here because that's where the jobs are. I've thought of moving back to the res, or near it, but I think I'll do better here. At least for a while.

Delbert Thunderwolf

I was in and out of a foster home all my life. I had some family that raised me, but it wasn't like most people think of family. Not until I moved here did I associate with older Indian people, really. I went to a boarding school with other Indians. The school was very strict. It wasn't terrible like some people think, or like they used to be when they didn't want you to be Indian, but it didn't teach me anything about myself.

The teachers were OK, none of them were cruel or anything, but they just taught you. Some of them tried to understand or to teach cultural types of things but since they were all whites they didn't know Indian ways, really. In the whole school we only had two Indian teachers, and the principal.

When I got here I found it not too difficult. I didn't go to school right away. I stayed out and worked at a store. I know lots of white people and they can talk to me pretty easy. I like talking to people. I'm not shy. I talk to the teachers here if I don't understand something. Sometimes they give something that's just totally confusing. Other Indian students sometimes won't talk, won't say they don't know, because they're scared of what people will think. I don't care. I'll just go up to the teacher and ask him. Usually they're pretty helpful.

I'm the only family I have so I always had to make friends, to get along. There are some old Indians that I have become close to and they have helped me a lot. They have taught me the spiritual side of life. I find a lot of it intense. If I need any advice, if I need any comfort, I turn to them. I'm very involved in the community where I live; it's all Indians mostly. We sing. We also have a pow-wow that I helped put together. That takes a lot of time because you have to raise money for it so there's lots of planning. It's a very busy life.

Tasting College

"We try to get the promising ones, the ones who look like college material, on campus between their junior and senior year in high school," explained one college administrator. "We want to give them a taste of what college is like." Like tribal influences, how a college "tastes" is in part idiosyncratic to the individual but also reflects larger cultural mores. Becky and Edie, for example, had taken a precollege program and they loved it. "We lived in the dorms for 6 weeks in the summer. We didn't have anything else to do, and it taught us about college. It was really fun. A whole bunch of us lived together and took classes in the morning and then we had different activities in the afternoon," commented Becky. Clinton Bennett also had taken a summer program, but for different reasons. "I needed a summer job, and they paid to have me come to college. It was a little boring. We took classes in business. The field trips were good. So was the swimming pool."

Students find their way to college in any number of manners. Some, like Becky, Edie and Clinton, take a summer precollege program. Others arrive on campus early to get oriented. "They had set up a program for us to get here before school began. It was about a month ahead of time," one student noted. "We got tours of the university, met other Indian students, and took English and math classes." Another student who arrived on campus early added, "At first I was real lonely. I took a bus and cried the whole way. But then I met friends, and my parents visited me." A third student said about the orientation program, "It's kind of dumb. They bring us here because they think we're dumb. Some of them are pretty nice, the teachers, but the whole thing is sort of a dummies program." A fourth student disagreed. "I think everybody should do this. This place is so big that you get lost, and when school begins, there's so much to do, you really need an orientation and time to cool down before classes start."

Obviously, not everyone takes precollege courses or orientation classes prior to their first semester. Indeed, most students have no experience with college life. "They had 'previews' the summer before I started, but I couldn't afford it," related one young man. "I was shocked, at first," stated one student. "All these people! And the lines were everywhere. I kept being told to go here, go there, get this signed, get these financial aid forms, go see this advisor. I was ready to go home." Another individual concurred: "I couldn't take it. I got there, did a few things, and just left." An additional person added, "The first thing that hit me was that I was a minority. I went to an all-Indian school. I lived on the reservation. Even in the town we shopped in most people were Indian where we went. I came here and I kept looking for other Indians." Another individual elaborated on the same theme: "Two of my brothers had come to college, and they didn't like it. One of them told me how everybody wouldn't like you, because you're Indian. That they'd think you're stupid."

Other problems also existed. "I didn't know," laughed one student, "that you had to register. I thought they told you what to take, like in high school. So I waited two whole days. I couldn't understand why everybody else got classes and I didn't. Then somebody told me." Another student related some advice: "My sisters told me that the teachers don't care. If you're not in class, it's your loss. That was the best lesson I learned." Some students also show up late, or they do not even arrive. One student explained the process she originally went through to get to college:

> I was all set to take a summer orientation course. My aunt had told me that it was good, and I was anxious to do it, but it cost money and the tribe never got the money on time, so I stayed home. Finally I was set to go to school and a family problem came up, right the night before I was going away. I had to stay home for two whole weeks and by then I just wondered what's the use? And they still needed me at home, so I stayed. I went in the spring.

Leaving Home

Clinton Bennett lived out in the country in a house built by the government in the 1970s. He grew up in the house with his brother and sisters. His father had some sheep, and his mother stayed home and took care of the children. They lived on a dirt road that turned muddy during rains and blew clouds of dust during hot summer months.

Their neighbors were close enough that their houses could be seen in the distance, but far enough away that the only sounds, other than their own voices, were noises of occasional cars passing on the road. At night the lights of distant houses were the only interference with the stars. During the day, a person could see for many miles. A large hill loomed in the distance in one direction, and in all others the land slowly rose and fell.

When Clinton was young, his father had to drive the boy several miles to school. By junior high school, however, Clinton only had to wait out on the dirt road for the school bus to come and pick him up. His neighbors and he went to a school on the reservation that was run by the tribe. About half of the teachers in the high school were Indian, and a lot of the white teachers were married to Indians.

"School was not too hard," he reflected. In general; students didn't talk very much about what they were going to do when they finished high school until their senior year. "In the fall they had a counselor from the university come out and she told us about different kinds of things we could study at college," related Clinton. His best friend, Bobby, decided he was going to go to a vocational school. Clinton did not so much decide about going to college; it just happened. He remembered:

> Sure, I thought about it, but I didn't know much about what it was really. My parents had never been there, but they said it was good to go. I finally got the papers and filled them out, and then a letter came and told me I was in and I should come and fill out more papers.

Throughout the summer he thought off and on about college, but he also thought about leaving home. "I didn't know what to expect—I had lived in the same house all my life, and then I was going somewhere strange. I was excited, but also scared." He had been to the city where the college was located a few times but he had never stayed overnight in the city. He had been by the campus on his visits to the city, but he did not know much about the college. As time drew closer to go to college, he grew more anxious.

> I knew somebody who went there, and I talked to him. He told me that I had to register and some things to expect like all the papers to do and the dorm room. We left together. His father drove us down. I took two suitcases, a radio, and some stuff my mom bought me like notebooks and stuff.

When Clinton was a freshman in high school, he had been "rowdy." "I got drunk and went around with a pretty wild bunch of guys," he recalled. Among other activities during that time, Clinton was involved in a car accident where the driver died. All of the boys had been drinking; other than the driver, no one was hurt, but the experience changed him. "When it happened, I realized how much I had disappointed my parents. My mom was just crying. I just stopped it. Stopped like that."

He had been a good student in high school, but not excellent. English was his best subject; science was his worst. He liked sports and played on the basketball team. During the summers he played with his friends and helped his father. He also participated in several ceremonies and activities that revolved around Indian culture and beliefs. He spoke his native language, although not well. "My parents speak to one another in [the native language], but they always spoke to us in English, so we didn't learn it too good."

Like many youth, the general tempo of his life abruptly changed when he left home. Quiet summer days, the unchanging speed of high school classes and afternoon basketball games came to an end. He was not particularly anxious to go away to college, but he realized he "had to do something, so it might as well be college." His parents did not push him in any direction, but they seemed happy that he was going to school. His older brother had just returned from the army, and when he came home he had had trouble finding work. His parents' hope was that college would teach Clinton a skill so that, when he came home, he would have a job. His father gave Clinton a little money for college.

His last night at home was like many others. "I ate dinner, went out, played some basketball, and when I was finished I said goodbye to my friends. I knew that some of them were also going away, but we'd be back in a while." When he got home, he remembered having trouble getting to sleep and waking up early. When he got up his mother, like always, was getting breakfast. The baby was in her chair, and the television set was on. He ate breakfast, said goodbye to his mom, and his father drove him over to his friend's house and he left for college. "I felt like I was leaving forever," he recalled.

"But I came home the next weekend. I was lonely and I used the money my father gave me to get the bus." Every weekend for the first semester Clinton rode the bus back and forth from the reservation to college. "When I came back," he said, "I felt different. I don't know why, but it was like I was different, not a kid." He remembered walking up the road to his house that first Friday night and hearing the familiar sounds of silence and his family's voices. He saw the lights in the distance of his neighbors' houses. "It was good, coming back. Indian people feel special about the land. I always knew that. I knew it that night, too."

II. COLLEGE LIFE

Housing

Rose Bird mentioned that her first roommate at college had not worked out. Several students had similar experiences. Bruce Crow Flies High arrived at college and found a roommate who had never met an Indian before. "I'd say he was curious. At first he didn't know how to talk to me. I felt weird. He finally moved out. It was nothing bad. He just wanted to live with a friend." Another student had a roommate who avoided her: "It was like we had two different rooms. She did her things with her friends, and I did my own things. There was never any trouble, we just weren't friends. Sometimes, when I came in the room, she and her friends would be laughing, and they'd get quiet and leave. But they never bothered me." An additional student offered a similar story: "I like being alone. I'm into karate, and I spend a lot of time at the gym. My roommate does different things. I have a lot of friends who are Hispanic, but not too many others, not too many Whites."

When Becky and Edie went to college, their parents moved with them. "We live at home," laughed Edie. "Our dad retired and they thought it would be good to retire here, so we all moved out together." Beth and John Wright live in married student housing, and their neighbors are also Indian. "We moved here when we had the last baby. It really helped. It's small, but it's close to school so we can take turns watching the kids," explained Beth. Added John, "I think it's harder for Indian students who are younger. The chance to go crazy or get lonely are much greater when you have to deal with the dorm."

Other students, such as Johnny Ortiz, arrived at school and lived with a relative or a friend from the reservation. One student, for example, said, "My sisters were here. When my oldest sister first arrived, she didn't like living in the dorm, so I didn't try it. I just moved in with my sisters and cousin." A second student explained, "I live with another guy in an apartment." A third student lived alone, "I like the quiet. The dorms are too noisy." And a fourth rented a house with six friends. "It's a big place. All Indian. It can get pretty wild, especially on weekends! But it's not too bad."

Classes

When Sheri Yellowbird first arrived on campus, she had not yet chosen her classes. When she got her catalogue, she grew confused. "They told me that I had to choose four courses, register, and get my advisor to sign for them." Her advisor was absent during the first week of classes but eventually got her course list. He explained how she had chosen her courses.

> When I looked at her course list it made no sense. She was taking physics and Spanish and then art history and a math class that she wasn't prepared for. Where was English? Why was she taking physics when she had only basic science courses in school? Why art history? It's an elective. She told me that she chose classes that all met in the same room. That was the basis for her curricular decisions.

Two years later Sheri laughed at the decision. "I just didn't know. The college was so big, and I figured I would know how to get to the same classroom. The classes were too hard, and it was terrible." The advisor reflected, "I first thought it was wry. How quaint! A student chooses classes that meet in the same room. But then I realized that she actually had made quite an intelligent choice from her perspective. The geography was too vast here, and she had narrowed it down."

Other students had problems about social interaction in the classroom. Angela Smith, the counselor mentioned in Chapter 1, related, "When I went to university I went home between classes I was so shy. And it took me a long time to walk home, too! We lived off campus, but I saw all those White people, and I just didn't want to stand around." Another student, Lila Hyden, went even further:

> It's a 2-hour drive from home to the university, but I drove back and forth. I had my little girl to take care of, and my mom and dad lived on the reservation, so I left her with them and then took classes. I really didn't have time for anything. I'd get up, drive there, take classes, study during the breaks, drive back, get my girl, cook dinner, clean up the house, study, and go to sleep.

One student recalled, "When I first came, it was total chaos! You don't know what you're doing. All the procedures, the stamps from the department." An additional student noted, "You have to know what to do before you get there, and I didn't." A young woman added, "You feel stupid when you don't know. You think it can't be this difficult because everybody's doing it, laughing and joking, having a good time." Her friend said, "That's another thing that's hard. People are always watching us. You have to be better prepared, so you're even more nervous. Another individual summarized, "Trying to adjust to college isn't easy. Having to meet deadlines, trying to develop study habits. And your family usually doesn't understand."

One young woman, Fanny James, had not yet completed her first semester. She spoke about her classes:

> I'm in big classes. I don't know, maybe 300 students. The teacher speaks with a microphone. I was good in science in high school, so I'm taking hard science and math classes. I want to be a doctor or engineer. I don't always understand the lectures, but I have a study group and we study together, exchange notes. I don't ask questions of the teacher. I haven't talked with them. I sit in the back with my friend. I always get there early, so we get a good seat.

Faculty and Staff Support

Some students already have spoken of faculty interaction. Rose Bird mentioned that she got along with one teacher who teased her. Sheri Yellowbird and her advisor appeared to work well together. Although other students mentioned similar kinds of interaction with individual faculty, the general comments made of faculty and staff on mainstream campuses was one of misunderstanding.

"People need to understand that Navajo is our first language," said one young man. "I make some mistakes in papers," added an additional student. "The instructor asked me if English was my second language, and when I told him it was, he helped me understand. He was the only one." Another student continued, "I don't want to be treated special. I don't think that they should think that, because we're Indian, we should get special treatment, but usually we're just anonymous." "It's beyond my comprehension," argued one student, "why people don't want to learn about the population they're teaching. These people have forgotten about Indians." Another student agreed, adding, "It's a big problem. Even though most students are Anglos, this place has a lot of Native Americans, and nobody knows about them except the few who reach out for some reason."

"Some faculty put us down," observed one female student. "And they don't realize they're doing it." " 'You're doing so well for a Native American,' they'll say," explained her friend. And still, some faculty are supportive and helpful. One student provided a portrait of a faculty member who helped:

> I was here once before, and I got terrible grades and left. When I came back, I got more terrible grades on my first exams. My math teacher took me aside after he handed out the exam, and asked me to see him. I had planned to go, but I didn't. The next class he walked with me after class and we spoke. He offered me tips on how to study. After every exam we went over my mistakes. I got so I liked it. I didn't do well in the class, but I passed.

Another faculty member had an alternative approach. Clinton Bennett explained:

> I had a professor who used a lot of terms I didn't understand, so I went in and asked him. He told me to go to the library and look up the words. I told the instructor, "I've never been to a play. I don't know what you mean by 'visual geometry.' I don't understand words like 'juxtaposition'." He'd say, "I don't want to hear that, that's just an excuse." Nobody went to see him because he was tough. But I learned to use the library, to look up and memorize words.

Advising, by and large, occurred informally or was absent. "The advisor signs papers," answered one student. "There's an advising center, but I've never been there," commented another. "If you get in trouble, they tell you to go to the advising place," proffered a third individual. "I know they've got counselors if you want," said a fourth, "but we don't go. We use Native American Studies."

Native American Studies

Native American Studies is situated in the center of the campus in an old house that has a long front porch. As with many small programs, Native American Studies has moved from place to place, but it finally seems to have found a home. The Center has a director, a secretary, and two project staff. A few faculty members are affiliated with the Center, but the overwhelming presence in the Center is that of Indian students. A large room with a Coke machine and sofa and chairs serves as a lounge. Students congregate there for any number of reasons.

"I meet friends to study there," explained one student. "I do too, sort of," said another. "Actually I come here to study, but I actually come to meet other Indian people." A third student agreed, "I can relax. I walk in the door, and I hear Indian voices and I can forget the outside world, everybody out there." Larraine explained how she first discovered the Center:

> When I got to college, I didn't have a very difficult time at first. Everybody speaks [about] how difficult it is to register and buy books and settle in to the dorm. I didn't think so. I found it thrilling. But then I got lonesome for my home. One Indian girl in my dorm told me I should go over to Native American Studies, they were having a fundraiser and selling lunches. So I went and everyone was so nice that I just kept coming back. It became my home away from home.

At his own institution Delbert Thunderwolf founded a Native American Studies Center as a focal point for his and others' academic and social support. He spoke about the Center as a gathering place for the many different tribal peoples:

> It's hard to get a bunch of Indian people together to do a certain function here. A lot of these Indian kids, they're real shy, standoffish. Some of these reservations are so big and so strong that it's hard to change that philosophy that you've got to be by your mom and dad in order to survive. They come off the res and they don't have the survival instinct for the big city. This Center is a place where people can offer some help, support.

Of course, not everyone uses the Center. "I'm too busy to go there," commented a single mother. "I know where it is, but I just don't use it," added another. John and Beth Wright used to go to the Center, but they curtailed their time. "Indian politics can become a big thing," said John. "Either your tribe has politics going on, and you're on one side and somebody else from home is on the other, or different tribes take over the Center. We just didn't want to get involved." Another individual added, "If you watch who uses this place, you'll see that it's all people from one tribe. Indians from other tribes go to another place."

A Day In The Life

Bruce Crow Flies High

Bruce is an 18-year old freshman. He is the student who commented that he wants to graduate from college and "get involved in solar power" on his reservation. He went to the university between his sophomore and junior years in high school for an intensive program in English and math. He has lived all of his life on the reservation and graduated near the top of his high school class. During the past summer he went to Exeter, New Hampshire, for a brief summer program. He has short brown hair and braces on his teeth. He wore sneakers, blue jeans, and a long-sleeved green felt shirt. He is tall and thin, and looks younger than 18. He speaks very softly. In the spring he commented on his experiences in college:

> I used to be homesick a lot. I was a majority, and now I'm a minority. It changes you. You might feel low in status. You might not speak up in class. Sometimes I want to ask a question. I have some points of view. Sometimes I wonder if I should express myself. You don't want to say a lot, because people might think you have funny ideas.
>
> I got a scholarship to come to school, but it came late so I registered late. My mother is the one who's been real instrumental in me going to college. My father didn't graduate from grammar school. I have an older sister who lives home with her baby, and I have a younger brother.
>
> I find the schoolwork pretty easy. You sort of have to take your own responsibility. Because I came late, lots of classes were closed but everything's straightened out now. I take English and math, and a career and personal development class, and fundamentals of communication and graphics. I've got a 3.2!
>
> I wasn't allowed to party in high school, and I really need to study hard. I listen to older people. I take their advice. The math class has study sessions that I go to, and some of us study together in the Native American studies center. We do our English assignments.
>
> My roommate and I didn't work out last semester, so he moved. I live alone in the dorm now. I don't know what I'll do next year. I haven't thought about it. For now, a normal day is that I get up at 5:30 in the morning and run. It relieves a lot of pressure—stress—if I run. Maybe something happened at home and you feel you should go home, or you got

> a bad grade. I'm very busy, so I only go to the dining hall for one meal. I don't have time to do all three meals. I'll just have a snack in the morning from a machine.
>
> After I run, I'll study my lessons in my room and then go to class. I have morning classes every day. Some of my classes are big, but others are pretty good. My English class only has 40 students. I always sit in the front so I can get good notes. I have friends who I sit with in every class except graphics. Then I sit alone. Two days a week I have free time between classes, so I go over to Native American Studies and do any homework I have.
>
> I'll go for a meal at lunchtime and eat by myself unless I see somebody from my high school. I don't mind it. One time a guy came over to my table and asked me if I had any friends. I could see the guys at his table must have put him up to it, because they were laughing. I told him I came here to get an education and that was most important. Most people leave me alone, and I leave them alone.
>
> I'll have more classes in the afternoon and then study some more. Sometimes I'll play football with the guys in my dorm. They asked me; I could tell they were looking at me to see if I could play when they first asked. I play pretty good. There's this one guy who always makes fun of my name—Crow Flies High. He'll joke about it. He doesn't mean anything by it. Some of the other guys will laugh. At first he kind of made me ashamed of my name, but I spoke with someone else about it, and he said I shouldn't be ashamed, I should be proud. That it just shows the guy's ignorance. So I ignore him.
>
> In the evening I study some more. I go over to the math center and do my math. We always have lots of math homework. Sometimes some friends will play basketball in the gym afterwards and I join them. I like sports. When I come back to the room I write in my journal. I just write what I've done that day, and then I go to bed.
>
> I go home most weekends. I either get a ride with a guy who's a graduate student who lives near me, or I get a bus, or my dad comes to pick me up. I like going home.

Doreen Begay

With three little girls under the age of 10, Doreen never has time for a leisurely moment on a weekday. Her routine since she entered school 4 years ago has begun with a whirlwind of activity as she tries to get the two older girls to school and the younger one to a sitter. At 28, Doreen is currently a junior majoring in electrical engineering. She remembered her first year as the worst:

> My husband left me when I was 2 months pregnant and we had just moved here. I hate taking time off, but being a single parent sometimes is too much, especially when the littlest was a baby. So I took a semester off

LIBRARY
West Virginia Wesleyan College

> once that spring, and then again a year later. She seemed to always be getting sick and I hated leaving her with a sitter. I felt terrible.

Off and on, Doreen's mother comes to live with her and has helped Doreen mind the children. But nevertheless, more often than not, Doreen is on her own. Up until a year ago Doreen did not have a car to get around town, but finally her father bought her a used car. A car has made quite a difference:

> When I first was here, it was very hard. I had to take the baby on a stroller down the hill to the babysitter. The girls would get the bus out front. I'd run to class and then go back up to the sitter's and then home in time to meet the girls' bus. On the way home I'd buy food for dinner and carry it in my arms with my books and everything and be pushing the stroller up the hill. And then I'd always forget something like diapers so I'd just get home to open the door for the girls and then I'd go back down again and come back up.

A car did not necessarily slow the pace of her life; however, it has changed it:

> My oldest daughter volunteered me to show her class in school how to make Indian bread. I couldn't believe it! As if I don't have enough to do! But I did it—I had a car, and it was possible. I dropped the baby off to day-care, went to class, then the store to buy the things, and then to her school, and then back to campus. I'm exhausted, but I know my daughter liked showing her friends, and I'm glad I could do it.

Doreen has found-different friends and teachers when she entered college who have played significant roles. The two sisters, Becky and Edie, are her best friends, and she spends most of her free time in a club geared to American Indian Students in Engineering (AISES). The advisor to the club and a faculty member have been quite helpful. Doreen continued:

> I'm older, so what I need may be different from other Indian students. I don't have time to socialize in the dorms. Becky and Edie are older also and we study together. We always say, "See you in the library," because we meet for 2 hours to study together. I don't have any free time, but if I have an hour between classes I'll come to the AISES room and study.
>
> People like June and Mary, the AISES advisors, take a load off of me. They know I'm trying as hard as I can and they're on the lookout for a scholarship and financial aid. My needs are real clear. If I don't have money I can't go to school. If I can't find someone to take care of my kids, then I can't go to school.

Perhaps because Doreen is older, she is also clearer about her career goals. She chose engineering because she has a facility for science and math and knows that good-paying jobs exist after she graduates. She also is not afraid to speak her mind.

> My advisor is great. I really rely on him. He's told me not to settle for a 2.5 grade point. Some companies will hire Native Americans with a 2.5, but my advisor says, "No, you're better than that. If they accept everyone else with a 3.0, then you should get that, too." That's really great, because people shouldn't think we can't do as good as somebody else because we're Indian. And I've got a 3.0, too!
>
> But not everybody is like my advisor. I was in an English class and the TV show 20/20 had just showed a very slanted show about Indians in a city. Lots of alcohol and drug abuse. The students in the class kept saying Indians had better clean up our act, that we didn't treat people right, and the teacher just allowed it.
>
> It made me mad. I told the students that they didn't understand. We know alcohol is a problem, but if they lived in a place where there were no jobs and racism was always putting you down, then they'd have similar problems. My dad is an alcohol and drug abuse counselor, and I know the problems. I told that teacher that she had better educate herself before she lets conversations like that take place. I know she was really surprised that an Indian would speak up like that. I get along with Anglos OK, but it's at times like that where they'll backstab us.

Analysis

Traditional View. It is at this point that the differences in methodological and theoretical intent between traditional and critical researchers come into focus. Traditional researchers might raise at least three issues with the data presented thus far. The first point pertains to methodological design. Questions arise about the reliability and validity of the data. Although Johnny Ortiz may have been recruited to college in an irregular form, can one assume that all American Indians are recruited in similar fashion? And what is one to make of Bruce Crow Flies High's sensitivity? Are all American Indian youth as sensitive as he, or is he an outlier? Before one is able to accept the data as anything other than anecdotal, then, samples and surveys must be designed so that it can be determined how representative the comments are of the population under study. Without such surveys, traditional researchers would argue, the data are little more than stories that may have an insignificant relationship to objective reality.

Further, is it possible to break down the large categories that the data imply so that causal relationships might be determined? John and Beth Wright and Doreen Begay, for example, appear to be doing well in college, and they are adults. How might one develop a sampling strategy that could determine relationships between age and persistence? Becky and Edie's parents went to college, but Clinton Bennett's did not; what are the implications of these contrary facts with regard to parental influence on college-going patterns? In this light, the data may have raised interesting questions, but the real challenge is to create models that provide greater understanding of the relationships among variables such as age and parental educational level to college going and persistence.

The second point a traditional researcher might raise is that, even though it may not be reliable or valid, the data appear to confirm several arguments raised by Tinto and others. Larraine Craft and her grammar school teacher, for example, corroborate the finding that the desire to go to college is greatly enhanced if a potential college-goer receives encouragement and support. Sheri Yellowbird and Doreen Begay appear to have advisors who exemplify the kind of activities Tinto's research and recommendations for practice outline. Native American Studies Centers seem to be the focal points for academic and social integration that traditional researchers say is imperative for college persistence. Thus, the data seem to support rather than contradict traditional research.

Third, if one accepts the findings of the data, the policy implications will support the kind of actions that traditional researchers have suggested. Summer school programs need to be created that enhance a student's awareness of college life so that someone like Sheri Yellowbird knows what classes to register for. Activities need to be developed so that the loneliness that Bruce Crow Flies High seems to feel will be avoided and he will become more integrated into the social life of the institution.

To be sure, other implications and confirmations exist for traditional researchers who analyze the data, and other problems arise about the validity and reliability of the sample under investigation. But from a critical perspective, what does one make of the data? How does a critical analysis differ from the traditional points just raised?

A Critical View. A brief response is first due pertaining to the concerns of traditional researchers, which will then lead to a critical analysis of the data. As discussed at greater length in Appendix A, the sampling design is both representative in its overall nature and in the examples provided. Quotes often reflect comments by more than one individual, so that, when students interpreted an issue similarly, more than one quote is provided. The point, however, is not merely to portray Indian students as if they all express similar opinions, but to highlight the multitude of voices that exist. As with any group, some issues will be perceived similarly, and other issues will garner a diversity of opinion. The challenge for the researcher is to develop a diverse sampling design that allows for the full range of voices to be heard, and then to portray the various similarities and divergences of opinion that exist. Most students portrayed here, for example, exhibited a similarity of opinion about the confusion that initially existed when they set foot on a mainstream campus, yet they had many different opinions about Native American Studies Centers.

Students were chosen from a variety of different backgrounds, tribal affiliations, ages, and the like to ensure that as representative a group of students as possible was interviewed. Consequently, interviews were conducted with a wide range of students, not merely with honors students or students who had participated in a summer program. The purpose was twofold. First, the desire was to create a portrait of how academe appeared to the broad array of students who attend the institutions. Second, as will be outlined in the next chapter, institutional policies most often are not developed in an individualistic manner, and variables that highlight one finding or another too often frame the victim rather than come to terms with the situation.

This concern pertains to traditional researchers' desire for greater specificity so that causal relationships might be developed. The assumption is that, once researchers understand the variables that account for persistence, institutions will be able to recruit as college participants those students who are most likely to graduate. Richard Pottinger's work is an example of the kind of research traditional researchers might desire from the data developed here. He concluded that Indian students such as Rose Bird or Delbert Thunderwolf who attended off-reservation high schools have a greater chance of graduating from college than those students such as Clinton Bennett and Bruce Crow Flies High who attended reservation high schools. He writes, "An Indian graduate of a reservation high school has a one in ten probability of earning a 2.00 GPA while attending (college). An Indian graduate of an off-reservation high school is twice as likely to earn a 2.00 or better" (Pottinger, 1988, p. 5). In an additional study of college students who attended high school on the reservation Pottinger concludes, "Indian students graduating in the top ten percent of their high school class were less likely to earn 2.00 or better GPA than were Anglo students coming from the lower sixty percent of their high school class" (1990, p. 41).

Although studies of the kind Pottinger and others undertake certainly warrant attention, in general, critical analysts do not assume that such studies offer fruitful avenues for understanding Native American participation in postsecondary education. A logical conclusion from Pottinger's work is that colleges should recruit Native

American students from off-reservation areas rather than from reservations. Such suggestions are overly deterministic. A similar line of reasoning could be developed about Native American students whose parents have a postsecondary degree. Previous research has shown that students with parents who have a collegiate credential exhibit a greater potential to graduate than those students whose parents do not have a college degree. Are colleges to conclude that they should only recruit students whose parents obtained a bachelor's degree?

Again, although traditional lines of inquiry make worthwhile points, the researchers essentially analyze the postsecondary world for the Native American as it currently exists without consideration of what kind of world should ultimately exist. The epistemological underpinnings of their work is assumed rather than explicated, so that their theoretical notions are never examined, which in turn effects methodological design, findings, and policy implications. To be sure, reservation schools have room for improvement, and Indian students whose parents are college educated will face different challenges than will those students whose parents do not have a formal education.

However, from a critical perspective, rather than read the previous data as evidence for how well or how poorly Native Americans are being assimilated into the mainstream, researchers and organizational participants need to come to terms with how they will incorporate the different voices of American Indian students into the organization. As opposed to choosing the most likely students to graduate from their institution, people in organizations need to develop strategies that will reach out and empower all participants—whether they have attended a reservation contract high school or a private urban academy, whether they have scored well on an ACT exam or scored poorly, whether they have parents who graduated from college or parents who did not.

Thus, a critical interpretation of the data will neither search for causal models nor develop policies to insure that students become better integrated into the culture of the organization. A critical analysis tries to make sense of the perceptions of the students themselves and the way they deal with their perceived realities. What follows is an initial discussion of such an understanding, which will continue throughout the book's remainder.

Familial and Cultural Influences. One of the paradoxes of educational institutions is that they are assumed to be providers of opportunity, yet minorities do not always perceive of them in that manner. Indeed, Ogbu (1989, p. 184) argues that a primary reason why traditional research has not come to terms with minority performance in education is that "[researchers] ignore the minorities' own notion of schooling in the context of their social reality." The mainstream notion of education is often at odds with minorities' perceptions and interpretations of educational institutions, which in turn influences minority responses to education.

Traditional researchers assume that education offers individuals the ability to take control of their lives. Yet the foregoing portraits offer a different interpretation. People in Indian communities often appear to have the sense that going to college puts them under control of others, rather than see it as a way of taking control of their own lives. Students do not see the ability to make their own decisions as necessarily positive. The ethos of Indian communities is that one responds to the needs and demands of others rather than asserting one's own control (Badwound, 1990). In this sense, the meaning of control over one's life that educational institutions seem to offer becomes a source of cultural conflict rather than opportunity for Indian students.

For example, students such as Clinton Bennett and Bruce Crow Flies High spoke of how much they enjoyed their homes, and they went home almost every weekend. Although encouraged to attend college, Johnny Ortiz initially stayed home. Even though he did not plan to return to the reservation upon graduation, Ortiz still discussed his future as if it would revolve around his family. Angela Smith did not view college as a friendly environment; she went back to her apartment between classes. And Sheri Yellowbird arranged her classes so that the spatial organization of her world would not seem so hostile. Other students seemed to engage in their classes as outsiders rather than as participants. Fanny James, for example, never spoke in her class, and Lila Hyden drove back and forth from home rather than remain on campus.

Some students did view college as an opportunity. Rose Bird said she looked on college with excitement and did not think of her initial days on campus as "chaotic." Becky and Edie also seemed to like college, although they had the additional security of living with their parents. Doreen Begay, although harried, had a quite traditional view of her education; she went to school so she could get a job. Yet even with these individuals the educational environment was fundamentally different from an Anglo student's environment. Doreen, for example, spoke of the classroom experiences of misunderstanding and of her Anglo students who would "backstab" her with racist comments. The manner in which Johnny Ortiz chose to go to college resembled Clinton Bennett's decision-making style more than a planned act that would afford him opportunities. Johnny and Clinton did not so much choose to go to college—it was thrust upon them. The students spoke of some teachers as helpful, but the norm was either that the faculty misunderstood Indian students or ignored them.

The point here is straightforward: for Indian students their cultural background frames their understanding and action of education in a manner fundamentally different from that of White students. Their perceptions of home and family create stronger allegiances than that of educational opportunities that appear elusive and contradictory. The opportunities are elusive because of the hurdles Indian students must overcome, and they are contradictory because their perception is that the world they come from, and the one for which education prepares them, are oppositional. Students have dreams, but they do not fit into the framework of mainstream institutions. If students are to survive, then it appears as if they will have to either alter their dreams or look elsewhere to fulfill them.

Influences of Class. Although this book is primarily concerned with cultural influences of college-going patterns, it would be foolhardy to avoid a discussion of other crucial factors such as class and gender. As with all other national data on Native Americans, very little information is currently available about generalized patterns of college attendance based on class and gender. As will be discussed in the conclusion, there is an obvious need for more fine-grained analyses of the differences that exist for students who are male and female, or who come from upper classes or lower classes.

With regard to class, what is presently known is not surprising. Dolman and Kaufman (1984, 1985) report, for example, that over 65% of those American Indian students who attend college come from families earning less than $15,000 a year, and that 5% of American Indian students come from families earning more than $35,000 a year. The data are unsurprising, in so far as it is common knowledge that the median income of ethnic minorities is lower than Whites. For example, the median income of the overall American Indian population is $21,000, versus $31,200 for Whites (Birdsell, 1984, p. 12). When the data are confined to areas where significant populations of Native Americans reside, such as the Southwest, one finds that Indians have about one-quarter the average per capita income of the Anglo population (Pottinger, 1988, p. 9). What is not known is rates of leave-taking based on family income when race is held constant; however, cursory studies such as Pottinger's indicate that class does not play as great a role in predicting retention among Native Americans as it does in the White population.

Obviously, one's class plays a role in the ability to attend and graduate from academe. However, in the past too many critical researchers have overlooked issues of culture and gender and focused on economic concerns and the relations of production. It is important to be clear here: to the extent that schooling mirrors the larger economic structure of society, anyone who resides in the lower economic strata will be less likely to attend college. The purpose in this investigation, however, is to examine how culture also influences and reproduces inequality. As Sleeter astutely observes, "Growing numbers of other radical educators occasionally string together 'race, class and gender,' recognizing that there are multiple forms of social oppression. However, social class and class theorists still receive most of their attention" (1989, p. 52). In large part, one purpose of this book is to address how culture pertains to college participation. The point, then, is not to overlook or dismiss issues of class, but to provide greater insight into the cultural arena.

The comments from the students also seem to highlight cultural issues more than economic matters. One may rightfully argue that Becky and Edie appear to have an easier time in academe because of their parent's economic position, but most students did not mention the economic hardships they faced; cultural dilemmas came to the forefront. Doreen Begay faced financial difficulties and had to have day care for her children, but she vented her greatest discomfort at the racist attitudes of Whites more than her economic situation. The concerns of Clinton Bennett or Johnny Ortiz and the others also seemed to revolve around cultural and familial factors more than economic concerns.

When one investigates the larger patterns of college going, economic determinants come into account. As will be discussed in Chapter 6, for example, many students attend tribal colleges, not only because they are cultural institutions, but also because they are affordable. The vast proportion of American Indian students attend 2-year public colleges, because private institutions are the most expensive in academe. Yet when individuals set foot on any campus, or when they think about attending college, cultural factors such as those discussed above are at work.

Influences of Gender. As with issues of class, two points pertain to gender-related research about Native Americans. First, next to no research exists. On a national level Fries (1987, p. 14) has reported that more American Indian women than men attend college. The proportion increased from 1976 to 1984 so that women outnumbered men by more than 18%. Close to 60% of the women who attend college are full-time, and the popular majors are in education, business, social sciences and health professions. Other than these statistics little is known.

The second gender-related point pertains to the focus in this book. Although of great importance, this study is geared more toward cultural influences than gender. However, unlike issues of class, as

Sleeter observed above, very little research has been done by critical theorists about how gender influences educational choice and participation in academe. This is particularly true with regard to women of color in general and American Indian women in particular. Ethnographic work can only take so many issues into consideration if the research is to offer "thick description" of particular phenomena; consequently, gender-related issues were not of primary investigation here. Nevertheless, gender-related concerns were obviously at work in the data presented above. Beth Wright's comments about being a single mother when John left her, or Lila Hyden's decision to live at home and raise her children, or Doreen Begay's comments in a similar vein attest to struggles that are unique to women. Those students who also appeared to have the easiest time of "fitting in" also were women. Larraine Craft, for example, commented that it was not difficult to register for school; Rose Bird did interact with faculty.

However, Angela Smith's reticence to socialize with White students, or Fanny James's avoidance of interaction with faculty, or Sheri Yellowbird's decision to choose classes based on geography appear quite similar to the activities of Delbert Thunderwolf or Bruce Crow Flies High. Presumably, Angela Smith, like Bruce Crow Flies High, did not associate with White students because of cultural influences rather than gender. Thus, although it is clear that gender influences how students approach college, it is equally clear, if not more so, that the culture of the student and the institution are backdrops upon which these issues get worked out.

In sum, this chapter has begun a discussion about how students perceive of college prior to, and after, they have entered academe. As culture is not monolithic, a variety of voices have been heard with different opinions about activities such as summer school programs or living with roommates. On the one hand Indian students are like other college students: rooming with a stranger can be awkward for anyone, and talking with faculty members can be equally discomfiting. Yet, on the other hand, Indian students also face challenges that are unique to their culture. .With regard to culture this chapter has portrayed the unique dreams and hopes Native Americans have and how they get played out on mainstream campuses. In large part the data offered a portrait of students whose voices are silenced and who feel alienated from their campus.

Finally, a methodological note is pertinent. Clinton, Lila, Sheri, Johnny, and the others all were college students when they were interviewed. Paradoxically, this book is about barriers to college participation and retention, yet everyone who has been heard has overcome that barrier. If the sample is representative, 85% of these students will not graduate from a 4-year institution. A higher percentage will not graduate from the institution they attended when they were interviewed. Whose dreams will be denied? Doreen Begay? Kenny Gwin? Fanny James? What are the influences that will force the vast majority—85%—of these students to leave academe? The answer to these questions lies in coming to terms with the students' perceptions of their lives and the historical and social circumstances in which they are found. In doing so, as Giroux notes, "It becomes possible to understand how they are organized and constructed within maps of rules and regulations and located within dominant social forms which either enable or disable such differences" (1988a, p. 14). And differences only exist in relation to the social forms in which they are enunciated, such as educational institutions and workplaces.

How postsecondary organizations are structured, then, and how the participants—faculty, administrators, and other students, for example—think about the organization obviously influences how Indian students are thought about and treated, and how their dreams are enacted or destroyed. In the next chapter, a discussion ensues about such issues.

Chapter 5

Organizations: Dreams Denied

The scant literature that exists about Native Americans in academe is almost entirely practice-oriented. Authors provide examples of programs that seem to work and offer suggestions about individual factors that appear to be crucial to Native American success (Edgewater, 1981; Scott, 1986; Padilla & Pavel, 1989; Ratwik, Malmberg, & Kibble, 1989). For example, Huffman, Sill, and Brokenleg (1986) tried to determine the different variables that accounted for college achievement between White and Indian students at two colleges. Edwards, Edwards, Daines, and Reed (1984, p. 31) investigated role models as "an important ingredient" for American Indian college women.

Literature of this kind has three problems. First, unlike Tinto or other traditional researchers, the research never suggests a theoretical orientation that robs the data of any generalizable worth or epistemelogical understanding. The authors never take into account how the particular variable under study relates to other factors that influence Native American lives. Second, the research is generally void of any contextual analysis, so that the reader never learns the structural or cultural dynamics in which the program is situated. Organizational processes are viewed as unimportant, and organizational goals are assumed to be mutually understood. Third, although programs are offered as exemplars, or suggestions are made about what makes for a good program, the research never takes into account the voices of those people under study—American Indian students—in order to comprehend what they believe are effective programs and practices. In effect, students are again absent, their voices are silenced, and their dreams, if not denied, are at least unacknowledged.

This chapter attempts to overcome these concerns through an analysis of three mainstream organizations—two universities and a community college—that have a significant population of Native

American students. Bruce Crow Flies High and the other students from the previous chapter attended these institutions. These institutions are representative of the climate and culture found at the other institutions visited for this study. By way of a critical analysis the chapter offers snapshots of structural characteristics of mainstream organizations and perceptions of organizational participants with regard to Native American students and their institution. Prior to entering the organizations, a discussion ensues about assumptions that are at work in the organizations' larger environment with regard to minority students. Since each institution discussed is a public college or university, the views and actions of state officials receive particular consideration. Where do policy makers contend minority students should go to college? What kinds of policies do state officials believe enable minority recruitment and retention? How are transfer agreements between 2- and 4-year institutions perceived? These are the kinds of questions that are necessary to come to terms with on a state level before one sees what takes place on an organizational level.

The purpose here is twofold. First, if authors such as those mentioned previously have offered suggestions for improvement and yet life has not dramatically improved for minority students, one wonders how the larger organizational and social contexts have influenced the specific actions that are recommended. Second, how can conditions for empowerment be defined, and hence reached, if the contexts in which the conditions for empowerment reside are not investigated?

Accordingly, the chapter divides into four sections. The first part offers a brief analysis of recent research efforts from a critical perspective about 2- and 4-year institutions. Chapter 2 offered traditional analyses of "the pipeline." This section offers a critical overview of the structural characteristics of the higher education system. In the second section the reader hears the voices of actors who participate in decision making at the state level about minority student policy making. The third section contains the three organizational portraits, and the fourth section analyzes the organizational worlds and their environment.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRATIFICATION

States with a sizeable Native American population recently have seen a significant shift with regard to the kind of institutions Native Americans attend. For example, in South Dakota in 1978 close to 60% of Native American students were in public 4-year institutions. Ten years later that number had dropped to 15%. In 1978, 22% of the Native American college-going population attended tribal colleges; that num-

Table 5.1. Native American and Anglo Attendance in Public, Private, and Tribally Controlled Colleges (TCC)

	1978		1988	
	NAM	ANGLO	NAM	ANGLO
SOUTH DAKOTA				
Public 4 yr.	.57	.62	.15	.77
Public 2 yr.	.00	.00	<.01	<.01
Private	.21	.37	.15	.22
TCC	.22	<.01	.70	<.01
ARIZONA				
Public 4 yr.	.17	.44	.19	.40
Public 2 yr.	.61	.53	.56	.57
Private	.01	.02	.03	.03
TCC	.21	<.01	.22	<.01
NEW MEXICO				
Public 4 yr.	.81	.90	.58	.80
Public 2 yr.	.14	.06	.35	.17
Private	.05	.04	.05	.03
TCC	.00	.00	.00	.00
NORTH DAKOTA				
Public 4 yr.	.55	.85	.38	.86
Public 2 yr.	.22	.09	.02	.07
Private	.10	.06	.09	.07
TCC	.13	<.01	.51	<.01
MONTANA				
Public 4 yr.	.73	.87	.39	.80
Public 2 yr.	.16	.04	.04	.09
Private	.12	.10	.03	.10
TCC	.00	.00	.53	.00

ber had risen to 70% by 1988. In one sense, then, the dramatic drop in attendance from public 4-year institutions was equaled by the similarly dramatic rise in attendance at primarily 2-year tribal colleges. Virtually the same statistics exist for Montana and North Dakota.

Arizona and New Mexico have quite disparate figures over the same time period. In Arizona college attendance figures remained the same from 1978 to 1988. In 1978, 17% of the college-going population attended public 4-year institutions, 61% attended public 2-year institutions, and 21% attended a 2-year tribal college. However, in New Mexico in 1978, 81% of the American Indian population attended public 4-year institutions, and 14% attended public 2-year institutions. By 1988 the percentage of American Indians who attended public 4-year institutions had dropped to 58% and the community college population had risen to 35% (see Table 5.1).

To summarize, then, by 1988 the vast proportion of Native Americans who attended college were in 2-year institutions, either public or tribally controlled. The American Indian population in public 4-year institutions had either remained stable and insignificant, or had dropped precipitously. White students during the same time either had increased in percentage at public 4-year institutions or had remained stable. When compared with their Native American counterparts, a far greater proportion of White students attended 4-year institutions than 2-year.

At least three questions come to mind when interpreting these data:

1. Is there any difference in terms of educational outcomes if a student attends a 2-year versus a 4-year institution?
2. What kinds of structures exist so that a student may transfer from a 2-year to a 4-year institution?
3. Why has such a shift from 4-year to 2-year institutions taken place? Why do the majority of Indian students attend 2-year colleges?

Researchers from the critical perspective have one set of explanations for the first question. In a recent national study Kevin Dougherty (1986) has found, for example:

> 1. In the first 2 years of college, community college entrants drop out at a higher rate than do comparable 4-year college entrants;
> 2. Among students who survive the first 2 years, community college entrants continue on to the upper division of 4-year colleges at a lower rate than do 4-year college entrants;
> 3. Once in the 4-year colleges, community college transfers drop out at a higher rate than do comparable 4-year college entrants. (1986, p. 25)

These findings support other similar research such as that by Alba and Lavin (1981), Velez (1985), and Nora and Rendon, (1988). This research is significant in that it appears clear that 4-year institutions are better suited for students who want a baccalaureate degree than 2-year colleges. Two-year institutions, however, may promote greater economic success for those individuals who desire a 2-year terminal degree or a certificate, and community colleges may promote access to at least some form of higher education.

Indeed, traditional rejoinders to critical analyses of community colleges have been that junior colleges are the best examples of open access and an egalitarian system of higher education in so far as

Table 5.2. College Participation Rates of High School Graduates Immediately Following Graduation, by Socioeconomic Status, Fall 1972 and Fall 1980

	Percentage Participating in Fall 1972			Percentage Participating in Fall 1980		
Low SES	14	11	1.27	17	15	1.13
Middle SES	25	18	1.39	30	19	1.58
High SES	57	18	3.17	55	19	2.89

SOURCE: NCES (1985, p. 224, cited in Karabel, 1986, p. 20). Reprinted by permission.

anyone can attend them, the costs are relatively inexpensive, and individuals may maintain employment and reside at home while they attend classes. The critical response to such assertions is that, on the one hand, community colleges have made it "possible for public four year colleges and universities to tighten their admission requirements and thereby to exclude on meritocratic grounds masses of students who, in the absence of 'open-door' colleges, might have felt entitled to a place in a public college" (Brint & Karabel, 1989a, p. 10). On the other hand, Karabel and others (Grubb & Lazerson, 1975; Grubb, 1984; Brint & Karabel, 1989b) have pointed out that, throughout the 1970s and 1980s, community colleges have been transformed "from an institution primarily offering college-parallel liberal arts programs to one emphasizing terminal vocational programs" (1986, p. 20). Further, students of high socioeconomic status were almost three times as likely to attend 4-year rather than 2-year institutions in comparison to a ratio of 1 in 13 for students from a low socioeconomic background (see Table 5.2).

One develops a perception that community colleges have been transformed from liberal arts institutions to vocational schools that no longer do very well in helping students gain 4-year degrees. Thus, to return to the questions asked about Native Americans in 2-year programs: (a) it appears that significant differences in educational outcomes exist between 2- and 4-year degree holders, and (b) transfer agreements may be superfluous in a system where one institution (the community college) no longer prepares students to move into the other (the university). The third question remains unanswered: Why has a shift in attendance from 4-year institutions to 2-year institutions for Native Americans occurred over the last decade? Each question warrants further investigation and analysis. In particular, what are the assumptions of state policy makers who set policies about college attendance and transfer agreements?

THE STATE ENVIRONMENT

"Politics and money," said one individual, "that's what we're about. And we've got too much of one and not enough of the other." The politics the individual referred to were actions by state legislators who often seemed to want to micromanage colleges and universities. The individual's comment about the lack of money is borne out by an empirical truth; states with sizeable populations of Native Americans are most often economically poor. Of the states referred to above, for example, all rank in the bottom third with regard to salaries for faculty and student expenditures (National Center for Educational Statistics, 1987).

Further, as Table 5.3 shows, 2-year colleges receive substantially less revenue per full-time equivalent student than do universities. As Astin has noted, "these data provide strong support for the notion that 'them that has, gets.'...Students who are denied access to the universities and more selective four year colleges...receive substantially less public subsidy for their postsecondary education than do students who manage to enter the more selective public colleges and universities" (1975, p.7). Thus, one answer with regard to why Native Americans have increased their attendance in community colleges becomes clearer: State admission requirements and financial aid policies have encouraged more students to attend 2-year institutions because they are less expensive than their 4-year counterparts.

Individuals expressed an array of comments with regard to the role of the state and minority student enrollment. Reflecting one opinion, an individual said, "Our 2-year institutions are underutilized. Students at risk can get a better education there, at less cost to the taxpayer." A second opinion extended the first: "At the state level we have to insure that minority students can transfer from the community college to the university. We have to build effective articulation agreements." Another individual commented, "One of the most important tasks we have, if not the most important, is to ensure effective articulation agreements between 2- and 4-year institutions."

Some individuals held opposing views; a Native American who had worked on the state level said, for example, "I'm opposed to tracking Indian students into community colleges. They're funneled into community colleges and they never come out." A second individual concurred: "Once you turn someone down from the university, they won't come back. Indian people do not make a good transition from community colleges." A third individual commented, "Who's kidding who? They don't know if this tracking helps Indian people; they do know that it costs a lot to send a student to the university and it doesn't to the community college."

Table 5.3. Educational Resources and Benefits of Different Public Institutions

	Type of Institution						
	2-Year Colleges	4-Year Colleges: Selectivity			Universities: Selectivity		
		Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Educational and General Expenditures	$1,533	$1,534	$1,758	$2,523	$3,101	$3,203	$5,408
Value of Buildings, Land, and Equipment	3,982	5,514	6,467	7,875	7,710	8,453	12,230
Library Expenditures	71	83	98	104	109	116	212
Expenditures for Financial Aid	60	77	94	129	133	190	316
Tuition	385	358	404	473	490	564	519
"Subsidy"[1]	1,208	1,253	1,448	2,179	2,744	2,850	5,205

[1] Educational and general plus aid expenditures minus tuition.

SOURCE: Astin, 1975; cited in Olivas, 1979.

An additional opinion was more encompassing: "It's everyone's responsibility—minority recruitment and retention—and we have to make the different institutions accountable." One individual had recently assumed a position where it would be his responsibility to monitor student transfers, and how many students graduated from the different institutions. He commented:

> It will take cooperation between us [the state] and the institutions. Legislators think you can just tell colleges what to do. But even when you set quotas—that each institution has to increase minority retention at a particular rate—everyone has their own view about how to meet that average. There's just different perceptions, and everybody will interpret things to their advantage.

The final cast of opinions pertained to the lack of data about minority students. "It's really not clear who goes where," said one state administrator. Another added, "I really couldn't say how many transfer. But I know it's not very good. We don't keep those kind of numbers." A third individual commented, "The university doesn't keep rates of retention, or if they do, they keep it very quiet." Another individual commented, "You've got to realize how short-staffed we are. We have a hundred things to do, reports to get out, queries to respond to, and we just don't have the hours in a day to get sophisticated about all topics."

Each of these opinions has derived from different assumptions and led to different policies. The opinion that minority students and universities are not suited for one another is based on the assumption that many minority students are ill prepared for the rigors of academic life, and that universities should not be forced to meet the needs of the underprepared. The assumption is that the role of the university is to advance knowledge by pursuing research; concomitantly, universities and their professors need to meet the needs of the economy. Business–university relationships need to be explored, and such activity obviates attention to other concerns such as minority recruitment and retention. This assumption has led to admissions policies that deny students entrance if they do not meet particular grade point requirements or ACT/SAT scores. Instead, the students are encouraged to attend a local community college, solve academic deficiencies, and then attend the university.

In turn, the assumption has been that the community college and university need to develop articulation agreements so that students can transfer. State analysts are keenly aware of the difficulty of creating such agreements. "Obviously, the university says 'wait a minute'," observed one state official. "They want to evaluate individuals and their transcripts. We've got to be the broker." "We've developed a course articulation matrix where students know from day one what will and what will not transfer to the university," added an additional person. "Different campuses have different policies, and it's tough for the community colleges sometimes in terms of their general studies requirements being accepted," noted a third person. "You have to solve articulation discipline by discipline, " argued a fourth individual. "You have to get people from 2- and 4-year institutions to trust each other. English faculty from both systems, science faculty from both places, have to get together. It's not easy." One final individual commented, "On a state level it can be difficult, but institution to institution takes time and communication, and it's possible. People begin to know one another and aren't so suspicious of each other. Right now, we have an excellent agreement with the [local] university and the [local] community college system."

The opinion that "it's everyone's problem" is based on the assumption that lack of minority involvement in postsecondary education is a problem that demands a solution. In contrast to the preceding opinion that assumed students needed to meet the standards of the university, this opinion assumes the opposite: all institutions must meet the needs of the student. The solution, then, lies in postsecondary organizations. This assumption has led to state-wide mandates so that all institutions must increase recruitment and retention of minority students by stipulated percentages each year. As the state monitor noted, as with any general statewide goal, room for interpretation exists, but the mandate is clear: Institutions need to be more aggressive in their activities pertaining to minority students. "We want change," said one individual, "and they're facing up to it."

The third opinion, that not enough information exists about minority students, has led to calls for increased monitoring and data gathering. "We need to know where they go, when they drop out, when they come back, exit interviews, a whole array of things that will provide us with greater knowledge of the problem," summarized one individual. The assumption behind this opinion is that increased knowledge and information will lead to better decisions about what to do with regard to minority recruitment and retention. Consequently, on a state level they are gathering data from institutions that track a student throughout his or her collegiate career.

In sum, although each of these opinions is quite different in assumption and policy approach, they all presuppose that the state should be an active, rather than a passive, participant in solving the problem of minority recruitment and retention. One group calls for state "brokering" relationships between community colleges and universities. The second group stipulates recruitment and retention goals that institutions must meet. The third group outlines particular informational needs they demand from postsecondary organizations. Virtually everyone on the state level perceived such an active stance as helpful. Summarized one individual:

> University officials worry that we'll get too involved; they're especially worried about state legislators. It's a legitimate concern. But I do not believe it is in the best interest of minorities to have the balance of power shift totally toward public institutions. Institutions, faculty, do not want to change; they are extremely slow with change, and they are parochial. People who want to shake up the university do not get very far in their careers. The state has the ability to act as a lightning rod, as leaders. I know we're perceived as bureaucrats, and that, if we just left you alone, you could do your job. But that's not true. If left to their own devices, universities wouldn't give a damn about what happens to minorities.

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXTS

Each institution discussed below has a significant American Indian population, even though the overall percentage of Indian students is relatively small. Indeed, one point that will be addressed concerns the ability to overlook a minority group, because they are not so large or as politically organized as other groups. The two universities and the community college have quite different ways of thinking about how to deal with minority students. In one sense the institutions reflect the policies of the state in which they reside. However, institutions also have a reality and culture that is unique to the organization. One problem that arises concerns the mismatch between organizational perceptions and beliefs held by other constituencies such as state officials. As will be highlighted, for example, the state assumes that students will naturally transfer from a community college to a university, but that perception is not matched by community college administrators. The purpose here is to offer an understanding of how the structures that organizational participants design and work in often do not meet the functions that individuals such as state officials desire. An organization's participants do not willfully obscure state goals; organizations operate in contexts and cultures that have their own designs and goals, and consequently the opportunity for miscommunication is great.

Sink Or Swim University

Approximately 3% of the 2,100 entering freshmen are Native American. To gain entrance to the institution all students must either have a 2.0 or better in their high school classes, or meet a formula requirement that combines high school class rank and performance on a standardized college entrance examination such as the ACT or SAT.

A few years ago the university closed the "General College," which enrolled students who did not meet the regular academic standards. Because of the closure of the program, the entering freshman classes have higher grade point averages and scores on college entrance exams. At the same time, the number of Native American students admitted to the freshman year at the university has been cut in half.

"When we don't admit someone whom we might have admitted to the General Studies program," related one individual, "we send them a letter explaining our rationale, and we suggest that they apply to City Community College (CCC) in town." Another individual added, "We want them to get their grades up, get the basic skills, the foundations that they need to survive here, and then come here."

"We're really not set up to aid in remediation," commented a faculty member. Another professor agreed and spoke directly about Native American students by saying, "Native American kids will be better off at small schools. Class sizes of 500 are recipes for failure, and that's what we've got in the freshman year. Students get overwhelmed here, they get lost." An additional faculty member added, "Some of our classes are bigger than the towns they come from. That's poor pedagogy."

The community college that students are referred to is in the same city as the university. Sink or Swim's president explained, "We're working out an articulation agreement with them. We have a critical commitment to getting a transfer agreement; we're working very closely with them." Another administrator added, "Like everywhere else, the faculty are suspicious of 2-year schools. But we believe we won't 'cool people out'; we will be able to get a good working relationship with them."

Although a tribally controlled college also exists in the region, there appears to be consensus that maintaining ties with the tribal college is difficult, if not impossible. The president commented, "I always had high hopes. But things are in such transition out there, and they never seem to follow through." The admissions officer stated, "It's been a long time since I've been out there. Almost as long as I've been here—21 years. The controversies never cease out there. They also mix remedial with college level. It's tough to have an ongoing kind of thing with them." Another individual agreed and suggested, "They should spend time with us on campus and see what we're about. They need information about us." And a third individual noted, "You read in the newspaper about tribal politics all the time. It's like musical chairs with who's who at the tribal college. If we had lots of time, I guess we could try to build something, but we've been burned a couple of times, and that's enough. You do what you can."

All Native American students who enter the university are placed in what one person called the "high risk category." She explained: "Native American students face so many obstacles—families, the schools they come from, cultural differences—that we put all of them into a high risk category. We try to monitor them more closely than others." The president explained, "They have a terrible problem with acculturation. They grow up without competition, and, when they come here to a university whose ethic is achievement and competition, it's tough."

Even though the students are considered high risk, in general, they receive the same kinds of advising and counseling support as all other students. "We try to mainstream," observed a counselor. "We want to treat all students alike." Another individual concurred: "All students are alike. I don't like picking students out." Consequently, as with other students, when students first arrive they have little, if any, direct contact with either an academic or social support adviser. Instead, students wait until they will declare their major in their junior year to receive individualized attention about issues such as which courses they should take.

A counseling center exists for students who avail themselves of it. As with all students, Native Americans receive "lots of printed information about what exists" with regard to counseling services. A Native American Student Services Center also exists that has a director and a secretary. The director explained the problems she had encountered:

> Students get frustrated. They don't know how to ask the questions. I'll tell them they have to work out their budget, but they don't know how, they don't know the terms. The university is so huge—the bureaucracy is so great—all these colleges and departments. You get lip service, but not much action. Faculty are not involved in the issues, they have their own things to do.

She continued by talking about the work of her office:

> Students come in here everyday. They congregate. Having a place is critical. I have several students who have family members far away. They have spiritual concerns too. Students have a cultural background and it's not affirmed, accepted. Usually faculty say they can't deal with it. It's not hostility, just indifference. At least, in here, they've got somewhere to go.

Two different views arose concerning the administrative obstacles students found when they first arrived on campus. On the one hand, the financial aid officer noted, "Overall, students don't complain too much. The tribes put a ton of money into it, and they always pay. Checks come late sometimes, but they come. I'm not sure if what we do really has any impact one way or another on students." On the other hand, Rose Bird commented, "I know students who just can't figure it out—things like getting a short-term loan, knowing all the services that are available, getting the money for scholarships. It's so much work that they've never seen before, usually they just leave." Lila Hyden, reflecting on her initial arrival on campus, told the following story:

> There are lines everywhere, that's the first thing you see. Everyone's so rude, pushy. When I came to get financial aid the lady didn't tell me that I had to go to another line to get my Pell, so I didn't get it. Then the next semester my girlfriend told me where to go. That check was just sitting there for the whole semester.

One way to combat the confusion students feel about their initiation into college is by way of summer enrichment programs or precollege programs that take place while the student is still in high school. One example of a program is a 3-week project funded by a tribal agency for students in their junior and senior years of high school.

"We expose them to university life," related the project's director. Each weekday students have 3-hour seminars on different topics such as business, marketing, and finance. University faculty also introduce them to the uses of the computer. Individuals from throughout the university lecture in the course for no extra compensation. In the afternoons and evenings a variety of social trips and activities occur. Students stay in the dorms during the project."

"It's not a recruitment effort," continued the director. "It's a program to get them to think about college, interested in college." At the end of the project the students write comments about the program so that the director and his staff can evaluate what took place and what they should change for next year's group. Other similar summer programs have come and gone. The programs generally exist on soft money; when the funding agency no longer provides the funds necessary to carry out the project, the program ends.

As with any large institution, the coordination and communication for a program often gets lost as individuals struggle to maintain their program's credibility. One individual, for example, commented on her program and pointed out its success: "We get students interested in the junior year in high school and we keep a hold of them straight through to graduation." Yet the program received suspicion from one individual who had overall responsibility for the area: "I won't say it's bad; I just suspect it's not as good as she says." And another individual on another part of the campus but in a related area expressed ignorance of the program: "I can't say I've heard of it. Has it been around long?"

Comments such as these reflect organizational aspects of the institution which impact on how minority students are treated. Two faculty members summarized the overriding ethos of the university. Commented one, "Most faculty would say sink or swim. This is a university and we've got to get serious about standards." The other said, "We want to move up in the ranks. To do that we've got to put our time into research, into funding. We can't be all things to all people." John Wright, Beth's husband, also indirectly commented on the university's ethos and how it related to Native American students:

> No one's behind the students. Personal support's a problem. No one's trying to help people succeed. There's not enough advising. We come here, and we know we're different, and we're never made to feel part of it.

Wright's comment does not reflect overt discrimination, but rather disinterest on the part of the organization's participants. "Indians or any minority group, any special problem," explained one individual, "demand faculty time. And the salaries are lousy here. Why should we spend time on something that we don't get rewarded on?" Two academic administrators pointed out how initiatives about Indian students were in the bailiwick of Student Affairs. One individual said, "I've been taken up with accreditation for the last year. We really don't address Native American students in this office." His counterpart noted, "I'm aware of what goes on because I attend an all-council meeting, but I'm not responsible for that area. That's Student Affairs."

A faculty member commented, "I've brought in a lot of research grants, but my salary is still terrible. At some point you have to think about why you work week-ends if it doesn't amount to anything." "I couldn't survive here without extra income," admitted an additional individual. "I'd help if I could, but I can't. I don't have time." Added a third, "You get a lot of mixed messages, and you end up doing what you think is best, what will help you. If you're altruistic in universities, you won't be there long. Helping minorities, or students for that matter, is the height of altruism." Thus, if one is "altruistic" and comes to the aid of students, then one is not likely to receive rewards from the institution.

Disinterest on the part of the organization's participants leads to a variety of perceptions about Native Americans. One person explained, "Some people come to me and tell me that they see an Indian woman get a thousand dollars in financial aid, and that that's more than they make, they take home. I have to tell them that person is also a single parent with six children to take care of and family obligations."

Another person said, "The students miss class a lot. Some kids will tell me their grandfather died ten times. They just disappear for 2 weeks and then ask how they can catch up." An administrator commented, "The Indian needs to understand that they've entered the White world, but White people need to understand that life is different for them too. I try to tell people that they need to understand people different from themselves, but they don't." A professor continued, "I should understand Indian culture. I also should understand Blacks, Hispanics, women, and everyone else, too. I also should read in my area, and get grants, and publish, and serve on committees. I'm not whining. But I may only have a couple of Indian kids in any class I teach. They just aren't a high priority." One individual who teaches many Indian students explained her own initial ignorance:

> When I took this job they told me that a lot of Indian students came from boarding schools. I thought that was just great, because where I come from, back east, boarding schools are for elites. Exeter, that kind of school. Well I got here and found something else. I had never seen an Indian until I got here. I had a lot of learning to do, and I did it on my own.

Patchwork University

The institution lies within a 2-hour drive of half of the Native American population in the contiguous United States. Five and one-half percent of this institution's student body of 13,000 is Native American. The average number of full-time Native American students is about 740. Students who apply to the university must meet the general admissions standards of the institution, which is the equivalent of a 2.0 grade point average in high school. Applications which do not meet the standards are reviewed by an Admissions Review Committee. A proportion of the incoming freshmen are then also admitted "on condition," which requires that they make up academic deficiencies. Approximately 20% of the incoming Native American class is admitted in this category.

Since 1951 over a dozen institutional studies have examined the educational and support services provided by Patchwork University for its Native American population. One of the more recent studies noted, "The recommendations of previous studies, that are consistent over 34 years, have been largely ignored" (Task Force, 1987, p. 5). However, even though many of the various task forces' recommendations have been neglected, one currently finds much activity with regard to recruitment and retention of Native Americans. And with this flurry of activity comes a variety of opinions about outcomes that will need to take place.

An American Indian faculty member shook her head and said, "Everybody's doing it—creating programs for us. It's like buying a microwave. One person gets one, and then another. But eventually you get tired of it and go on to something else." Another individual said, "I haven't seen much happen other than talk. It's as if writing the report is the activity." A third person commented, "We're all doing bits and pieces, like a patchwork quilt. The task force needs to hire someone to coordinate. We haven't tied anything together." A fourth person, a college dean, commented, "Blue ribbon committees that just write reports are not enough. They never get to me, so I can't implement what they say. I can't get people in the college involved. You need to institutionalize things, and we don't do that." A fifth individual optimistically observed, "We have encouraged creative solutions, so we have a mosaic. We don't have a coherent direction, but the creativity is there."

The creativity that the individual referred to is a potpourri of special programs developed to aid Indian students' transition from home to the university. Different colleges have counselors who visit reservation schools and try to get students involved in a variety of activities that will move them in the direction of attending Patchwork. "We have to get to them early. We need to get involved with them in the high school, with their counselors, with their parents, so that they are better prepared for college. Otherwise, they're just lost." A second individual noted, "We're not doing enough, but at least it's a start. At least we realize now that we've got to go out to the reservation, not so much to recruit anymore, but as a preliminary act of retention. Start clubs, get them involved." Doreen Begay and Larraine Craft also agreed that high school students need to be encouraged about attending college. Doreen Begay commented:

> Even at the high school level, you're discouraged from attending the university. They tell you to go to the community college. I felt like I wasn't college material, and I didn't even know what that meant.

Larraine Craft continued:

> Parents need to be involved. If they're there, then the parents will help. They need to be included. My parents are monolingual Navajo. White teachers or counselors from the college overlook things because they think they need to teach us that education is important, that our parents don't know. But education is very important—look at how important high school graduation is.

Summer programs also abound for students who are either in high school or incoming freshmen. A counselor of one precollege program commented, "We design summer classes that fit with their culture. We have a lot of Native Americans involved. We concentrate on math and reading. A scattershot approach doesn't work." A second person commented, "The most difficult thing is lining up the kids in the right programs. Right now it's catch as catch can. People don't know what's available." One person confided why she thought she had a good number of American-Indian students in her program: "I employ lots of Native Americans, so the students are comfortable coming here."

Individuals voiced concern about what happens to students when they first arrive on campus. The concerns involve the students' initial transition and advising. A faculty member commented, "A lot of students never even make it to campus. Financial aid is a problem. They don't know how to budget finances, they don't spread it out over time. The checks might be late, and then they're gone." A student services administrator said, "They're here a few weeks, and then we don't see them anymore. Sometimes we don't find out they've left until months after they actually went home." A faculty member who has become closely involved with Native American students observed, "Initially, they don't know who to turn to. They've learned to seek help from their family, and probably no one from their family is here. They get lonely, go home, and we won't hear from them for a year or two." An administrator commented, "I'm embarrassed to say I can't tell you how many Indian students are in this college. We don't have that kind of basic data yet."

The problem with advising concerns how students choose their major. Each student has an advisor when he or she enters the university. "The advisor looks at the student's high school transcript," explained one faculty member, "and if the student is in the top part of his class, then he gets tracked into things like Computer Science or Engineering." An education professor continued, "They start taking preengineering courses, and no one flags them because they haven't really declared their major. Yet within a few semesters you see GPAs of 1.0 or 1.5. It's very difficult to get out from behind that kind of ranking." A fourth person noted, "When a student gets a 1.0 in that area, he'll lose his tribal scholarship and he's out." An additional faculty member added, "Either a kid comes here without the skills to make it and has a tough time, or he doesn't get the right advice and finds himself in the wrong classes and doesn't know what to do."

An anthropologist commented, "We have a White model, and they're supposed to fit into it. Surprise! They don't. Indian way, you go from singer to singer to singer to put the pieces of the puzzle together yourself. Education is active. We encourage passivity."

Another faculty member noted, "We assume too many things get understood by memo, or that information travels by word of mouth. If you're out of the loop, you don't hear it." "Advising isn't good enough," concluded a young professor. A dean offered, "Recruitment and retention has been a concern of admissions and student services. That's got to change. It's a new phenomenon for the academic side to get involved. We have to make it a priority if it's going to work." A final individual added another problem, "Everyone knows that role models are important. But we can't afford hiring Native Americans with doctorates. We try; some are here now. But they'll leave in a year or two, hired away by larger universities."

One hears at least three different definitions of how "it's going to work." One plan calls upon students to attend local community colleges prior to transferring to the university. Echoing comments similar to those heard at Sink or Swim, an individual noted, "Most people aren't ready for college work. They need skills." A second observed, "If they go to the tribal college they do better when they come here." An individual versed in retention statistics said, "It doesn't make any difference what kind of community college students go to—tribal or local—but they have a better chance of succeeding if they go to a community college first and then come here."

The plan to utilize community colleges necessitates that the university cement their relationship with the various community colleges. "We try to do things with the tribal college, try to coordinate it, but it hasn't worked out well yet," said one individual. "We have good relationships with the local community colleges," said a second individual, "but not with the tribal college. It's not bad, it's just not good. However, they have an important role to play and we better figure out how to include them."

A second plan of how "it's going to work" is relatively new and more ambitious. The president has a reputation for voicing concern about minority affairs, but he has yet to undertake a major initiative. One of his assistants, however, explained that the university is about to embark on a threefold project. He elaborated:

> The university has to redefine its role and become much more interactive. It implies a shift in thinking from a cloistered community to a more interactive community. The university has to help out, and get involved in culturally sensitive ways.

The three plans that the president advocates involve a close interaction between the university and reservations within the proximity of the institution. The president's assistant continued:

> We have to do things here like build better summer programs, create a better advising system, establish a first-class Native American Studies Center, things like that. But we also have to get centrally involved with

> the reservation high schools, the schools. We'll work with assessment, curricular development, pedagogy. It all depends on the extent to which we are invited, of course. Finally, regardless of what we do, there has to be economic development on the reservation. We need to help out in any number of ways. If wells need to be dug, we have civil engineers who can help plan. We have planners who can aid in any number of ways.

Such an ambitious plan will require funds that do not currently exist in the university budget, and a lasting commitment on the part of the administration. The institution may receive federal funds in order for the projects to gather momentum. The assumption is that the initial influx of federal money will allow the institution to obtain additional funding from other sources. The president's assistant concluded, "The president is firmly committed to this. He wants to see us get involved." However, one individual who worked on the initial stages of the project bemusedly observed, "This thing is on top of everything else we're supposed to do. It's another duty I've got. Like I have spare time to take on another project!" Another individual agreed that the goals were ambitious: "The president thinks we will get a large sum of money from the legislature yearly for this, and I think it's overly optimistic. If we don't, the project will die on the vine."

The final idea about "how it's to work" is more modest and individualized. Occasionally, faculty and administrators spoke about the need first to educate themselves and then to develop policies that will aid American Indian students on campus. "Our teaching methodology is faulty," concluded one faculty member. "We don't realize that people learn differently; we homogenize, and we have to think differently." Another individual commented, "Faculty are key to what happens in the classroom. They need to be aware of culture. We're developing culturally sensitive training for them." A teacher admitted, "We presume we know what's best for the Indian. Counseling and testing is a mess here. We counsel from an Anglo model. There needs to be brokering." An individual new to the institution observed, "We never ask the students what's needed. That's got to change. We need to become better listeners."

Most individuals who spoke from this line of reasoning felt they had located one of the problems of American Indian participation at the university, but they were unsure of what solutions to develop. A new assistant professor in the English department spoke personally:

> Last year I made as many trips to the reservation schools as possible. I listened to as many people as I could. I'm a White woman from Detroit, and I first thought this is crazy, what am I doing. But I've learned so much. I've learned not to generalize. It's not my culture. I'll never understand it.

Through a grant she developed an innovative, intensive English course that utilized one teacher for every 12 students for 6 hours a week, rather than the norm—one teacher for 24 students for 3 hours a week. Previously students who did not place into freshman English had to take a noncredit remedial course until they reached a suitable level for English 101. Remediation had not been successful. This program speeded up a student's learning so that individuals took the course for credit and were able to place into regular English classes with relative ease. Thus, rather than slow down the pace of learning, the professor speeded it up. The instructor's belief was that pedagogy needed to be culturally based and situated in the experiences of the students. She expanded on what she found when she visited the reservation:

> I talked with different people. I was the listener. They were the experts. I just kept listening. People were stunned that someone would listen to them. "Usually the university comes out and tells us what to do," they'd say. I'm not trying to be cute or tricky. I believe they know more than I. I know about teaching English, but to implement it, to get it going, I had to turn to those who know and they taught me a lot. I'm still learning today.

Although the project had achieved its goals of moving students into regular English classes, two problems appeared. The English professor elaborated:

> It's expensive. That's one thing they tell me. I wonder if this will be picked up by the university. They say it's not cost efficient. I ask them if it's cost efficient for students to take remedial English over and over again. Or if it's cost efficient to lose students, or if it's efficient to have students who can't read. We've engaged students, made knowledge immediate, and students learn.

The second problem was more personal:

> I haven't had an easy time here. This composition class has been a lightning rod. It makes people unhappy, because it strikes at what they do. Some people think I'm too radical, too young, a woman. They say I've polarized the department. I have moments when I think I'm the luckiest person alive, when I see students clicking, they're getting it. But I wonder if I'm paying too high a price. I'm worried about tenure. The demands on my time are enormous. This class gets me no benefits and has angered some.

Another individual commented on the general tenor of the organization by saying, "It's odd. This is the friendliest place I have ever worked. Very nice people. But people also feel disenfranchised. No one looks at the total program." A dean said, "Last year I gave out a 1.1% salary increase. It's hard to get people motivated to do anything with those kinds of incentives." Another individual agreed: "People are not so driven here. The rewards are not in work, but in other things—family, recreation. That's not bad, but it doesn't produce that extra effort if you want to do something special at the university." An additional faculty member noted, "The dean tried to help us by reducing our teaching loads. It used to be 4–4 and then 3–4. Now it's down to 3–3 or 3–2. That's great, but the twist is that, in order to do that he's had to increase class size, which is bad for minority students and reduces the possibility for involvement." One person concluded, "We're trying. Lots of effort. But the overall atmosphere precludes dramatic change."

City Community College

In many respects City Community College (CCC) is typical of countless other urban community colleges. CCC opened in the 1960s and currently has about 18,000 students, many of whom are part-time, and the majority of whom will obtain either a terminal degree or certificate. The administration does not keep precise records of how many American Indians attend the institution, but they have seen an upswing in attendance over the last few years, in part because of Sink or Swim's new admission policy. Again, like other community colleges, CCC has a relatively open admissions policy. A student registers, takes a battery of tests such as the ones Johnny Ortiz and Kenny Gwin took, and based on the test scores, a counselor advises the student about what is available or what the student must do to complete the specific courses desired.

CCC is entirely geared to the marketplace and jobs. The first pages of the college catalogue provide information about how much it will cost to attend CCC, and then each area of study is outlined with regard to how many students graduated within the last year and what kinds of employment they found. The chart outlines average salary scales for the positions and the percentage of individuals who found employment. Registered nurses and machine tool technologists received the highest salaries of $26,500 and $21,200, respectively. Automotive body repair and welding received the lowest salaries of $7,000 and $10,000, and the overall average hovered around $15,000. No course of study had less than 50% employment and the preponderance of courses employed greater than 80% of its graduates.

"We gear up and down according to the marketplace," observed CCC's president. "We don't have tenure, so if the bottom drops out of one course of study we downscale and move onto another." All the courses of study had advisory boards of individuals from the business community in order to meet more fully the needs and expectations of business and industry. One individual noted, "We get kids who want jobs. They may never have had an opportunity without a place like us." Another individual added, "Class size is small, no bigger than 24 students, because we realize students need close attention." And a final individual commented, "We have training programs here. When someone gets through, they'll have a job. We have an excellent placement service that not only helps look for jobs, but also provides training in things like interviewing techniques, how to write letters."

Native American students, as part of the CCC community, were free to use the services available to all students. "We mainstream," answered one individual. "Our counseling is for class placement, job placement. It is not special services." The president agreed. "Mainstreaming is essential in order to keep class size down. Minority students do not receive special counseling or separate centers. We believe student–teacher interaction is essential for success for all students, so the question becomes, how do you maintain small classes?"

A faculty member talked about her class and American Indian students:

> In a class of 25 I may have 4. There's no in-between with them. I either have A students or F students. They have no sense of time. Due dates don't mean anything to them. They also don't make excuses, they just don't do the work and don't ask if they can make it up. The A students just do it. They don't ask questions, either. Sometimes I purposefully give an incomplete explanation, so that students will come talk to me, and the Indian students don't; they just find out how to do it. The other students—Whites, Hispanics, Blacks—will ask me what I want. None of the Indian students are "lazy A" students who will get it all out of you before they do the work.

Another individual agreed with the instructor's perception: "Maybe once in a great while I'll become friends with one, a counseling kind of thing, but that's rare." A third individual added, "I don't know much about their background. Other students tell me about their backgrounds, but never Indians." A fourth person commented, "I've noticed that they don't like eye contact. I've learned small things like that. And sometimes they just disappear and then they return. They're very different students."

One individual in the administration was an American Indian. He provided a different explanation:

> I'm particularly concerned about them, because they're my people. I watch out for them. A lot of kids arrive here and don't know what they're

> getting into. They're given a $3,200 check and told to budget their money. That's more than any 18-year-old has seen, usually. So they get lost. Indian students need to trust teachers; teachers need to reach out first, the students won't. I have students who hang around my office. We joke, laugh. Sometimes I can't believe the patience they've got. It boggles me that Indians are so patient with all the paperwork; I think sometimes we take advantage of that. If we did that to Anglos, they'd shoot us.

A White person new to her job offered a similar analysis:

> I think you have to try to understand their lives, but that's not something that's part of your job. As a White person, I'll always be White. That's certain, I can't be anything else. But I can try to understand, try to see what Indians' lives are like. It takes time. And a willingness, too. I've heard people who lived here a long time say they understand Indians, but they say bad things, racist things. Well, they don't understand them. I have to keep asking questions. Those people who think they know have stopped asking; they just give easy answers.

The discussion so far has highlighted CCC's courses of study as vocationally oriented; as one might anticipate, transfer programs also existed. A document recently had been created for all students who desired to transfer to Sink or Swim, so they could see which courses at CCC transferred and into which departments they fit. One aspect of the articulation agreement which facilitated the transfer process was that CCC adopted the same numbering system as the university; English 101 at CCC, for example, transferred into the English department and substituted for Sink or Swim's English 101. In this manner, students had an easier time figuring out what courses they needed to take when they transferred.

Certain problems existed with articulation. One individual commented, "I'm troubled by it. We can't force Sink or Swim to get involved in this. Sure, we have a document. But I don't think they're cooperative." Conversely, various faculty at Sink or Swim did not know of any formal articulation agreement between CCC and them. Another individual commented, "Students need more counseling than just a sheet of paper, and unless they're real clear about it, things get lost." With regard to Indian students, "getting lost" was particularly acute. "I tell them to go to Sink or Swim, get a catalogue and walk around," explained the American Indian administrator. "I tell them to go to their department and ask what they need. But it's so big. It overwhelms them."

Thus, articulation agreements were in place, but they were not particularly utilized. Some individuals argued that transfers should be thought of as another course of study rather than a primary goal of the institution. "You can't match apples with oranges, " commented one individual. "We shouldn't compare a kid who comes here to get a job with another one who wants to go on to the university." In this light, the percentage of students who transferred to a 4-year institution was insignificant at best, and unfair at worst. The president explained:

> A 4-year degree is not the be all and end all. I've had students who came here who had master's degrees and couldn't get a job. We have students transferring from the university to here. And some kids come here and think they want a 4-year degree, but then they see that their friend has a truck driving certificate and makes $20,000 a year right away. Why wait and maybe not get a job, they wonder. Numbers that prove that kids don't transfer do not mean a thing. We serve our clientele.

From this perspective, although articulation agreements had recently been set in place in a formal manner, one should not expect significant changes in the number of students who transfer. In effect, a bridge had been built, but those individuals for whom the bridge had been built may not want to utilize it. "Can you blame them," asked one person. "We're effective in what we do, and we're set up to get people jobs. It's a whole different mindset to train people for more schooling." Another person continued, "If the market in their area dries up, they know they can come back here and pick up another skill. We teach skills. That's what comes across here."

Comments from the students also portrayed individuals who concentrated on vocational skills rather than bachelor's degrees. Kenny Gwin wanted to be an electrician, in many respects, because he had not considered any other options. Although Johnny Ortiz had graduated salutatorian in his class, he studied laser technology. He mentioned that he might "someday get a college degree," but that goal was distant, obscure. He had walked on the Sink or Swim campus, but like other students, the size and hustle-bustle of the university had not made him feel like it was a place where he wanted to spend his time. He had not talked with anyone about what he needed to do, what courses he had to take, to transfer. Delbert Thunderwolf also had given little thought about college. "I want a job that pays more than minimum wage," reasoned Delbert. "Maybe someday I'll get a college degree, but not right away, not now."

ANALYSIS

Scollon and Scollon (1981, p. 12) have noted, "The greatest cause of inter-ethnic problems lies in the area of understanding not *what* someone says but *why* he is saying it." The need arises, then, to come to terms with the assumptions behind the statements of state policy-makers and organizational participants so that their comments can be fully understood. What follows is, first, a deconstructionist analysis of two of the speakers' comments, and then a discussion about how these comments appear within a critical perspective. To reiterate the observations, the first speaker said, "The major problem is that they have a foot in each culture that draws them back to their roots. They are drawn back to their culture and it's a difficult transition to make. It's a real problem that's not easy for us to solve." A second speaker said, "They have a terrible problem with acculturation. They grow up without competition and when they come here to a university whose ethic is achievement and competition, it's tough."

"They have a terrible problem with acculturation."

The statement defines how the speaker perceives the situation. Those who have the "problem" are Native Americans; the "problem" gets defined as acculturation. Native Americans have difficulties in postsecondary education, because they cannot figure out how to move into the mainstream. The "problem" is not minor. American Indians have a major problem, which the speaker defines as "terrible." Thus, the nature of the problem is that Native Americans need to acculturate in order to gain a foothold in mainstream postsecondary institutions.

"They grow up without competition, and when they come here to a university whose ethic is achievement and competition, it's tough."

The individual follows his first statement with a consistent line of reasoning. He is aware that Native Americans do not compete, and that competition exists at his university. The institution's ethos also is defined in terms of "achievement." Presumably, the speaker sees the achievement, the accomplishment, as graduation from college. The route to that achievement is competition. Because American Indians do not know how to compete, "it's tough."

The other speaker commented:

"The major problem is that they have a foot in each culture that draws them back to their roots."

Again, the speaker defines the problem as American Indians' inability to plant both feet firmly in the soil of the university. Because they have a "foot" in their own culture, Native Americans are drawn back to their "roots." The problem, then, is that Native Americans have extensive roots, and until they cut those roots, they will not be successful.

"They are drawn back to their own culture, and it's a difficult transition to make."

The speaker reemphasizes his first statement. The culture in which a Native American student resides has a serious pull; it "draws" students "back" rather than pushes them forward. To move from one's own culture to a mainstream university necessarily implies a "transition." Presumably, then, to attend a university requires that one move from one world to another—move from the Native American culture to a mainstream one. Of consequence, the movement propels the students forward.

"It's a real problem that's not easy for us to solve."

The speaker concludes with objectifying Native American students—they are a problem—and the realization that the problem is a difficult one. The problem is also "real"; unlike some problems that mask other concerns, the speaker implies that he has been able to define the problem precisely. However, the problem is like a puzzle; the solution will not be easy.

The individuals charged with solving the puzzle are identified as "us." Insofar as the speaker was a senior White male administrator at a mainstream university, we can reasonably presume that the problem's solution lies in the hands of similar White male administrators.

The point here is not to uncover organizational villains, for such an analysis would belie the deep structural contradictions at work within academe's system. Both individuals whose comments have been analyzed have reputations as advocates for increasing their institutions commitment to minority reform. Yet their comments highlight the assumptions with which they—and their colleagues—think about how to solve the "problem." The problem resides with Native Americans, and the solution lies with the administration. The problem pertains to one group's inability to fit into another group because of the minority's history and culture. The solution to the problem will be a transition from a past state to a different state. The speakers mirror Tinto's concept of college as a rite of passage; a key problem concerns the inability of individuals to become academically and socially integrated, and the solution lies in the development of ritualized activities that foster assimilation into the mainstream.

Given the three institutions portrayed, it also would be mistaken to assume that everyone thinks like the speakers just analyzed. The assumptions of the different participants often contradict one another. The state officials felt that creating transfer agreements was one of the most important activities they oversaw. Administrators at Sink or Swim, and some at Patchwork, also concurred that articulation agreements between 2- and 4-year institutions, although difficult to enact, were essential. At City Community College one found an alternative interpretation. Articulation agreements should exist so that, if someone wanted to transfer, it was possible, yet the culture of the organization mediated against transfer. Terminal degrees and jobs concerned the organization's participants.

At Sink or Swim and CCC many individuals felt that "mainstreaming" was important. At CCC, they mainstreamed as a means to keep costs down and maintain small class size. At Sink or Swim they mainstreamed with the assumption that everyone should "sink or swim" in similar fashion. The push to move students to the community college was because students did not fit into the mainstream. Some state officials also felt that a clearer delineation of duties between community college and university would be more efficient, which in effect, helped mainstream some students and relegate others to community colleges. At Patchwork some individuals worked from a different point of view. The English professor tried to teach students by calling upon their culture to provide the framework for her pedagogy and curriculum.

Different individuals in each of the institutions also pointed out that they did not feel their institution reached out to minorities and tried to understand them. The American Indian administrator at CCC noted how he related to Indian students and how others misunderstood them. The anthropologist at Patchwork argued that the advising system was flawed because it was set up in a fashion culturally different from Native American models of education. The Native American state official commented how the absence of cultural understanding tracked minorities into community colleges.

One similarity among most of the participants was the organizational disincentives for involvement with minority issues. In some respects the disincentives had nothing to do with minority concerns, but from another perspective, these disincentives played a key role with regard to how minority issues were perceived. For example, salaries were low at the institutions, and most individuals thought of themselves as extremely busy. A dean raised salaries one year only 1%; another individual spoke of many other activities that demanded time; a third person spoke about how she had to do consulting in order to make ends meet, which left no time for other concerns. The untenured English professor worried about tenure and the time she spent in a project that was not appreciated. Summer programs provided short-term funds, but they soon disappeared when funding dried up; because there was no apparent need for across-campus conversation, individuals did not know what other individuals attempted in their own programs. Each of these examples highlights organizational dilemmas, which in turn affect minority affairs.

One arrives at a picture of institutions and individuals that are not hostile to minorities, but indifferent. Officially students are encouraged; institutionally, they find discouragement. Responsibility is partitioned and goals are elusive. Some individuals think other institutions should deal with "the problem," and some individuals believe that other individuals within the same institution should be responsible for minority affairs. Overt acts of racist behavior may not be readily apparent, but the lack of understanding of minority issues is a constant theme. To reiterate the point made at the chapter's outset, Native Americans make up a small percentage of each institution. One teacher spoke of perhaps four Indian students in her class of 25, and of those four students, the best students did their work on their own, and the worst students failed on their own. Unless someone made a conscious effort to reach out, students were left to their own devices to figure out advising, financial aid, transfer, or a host of other institutional activities.

Thus, if college is an integrative ritual, it is a dysfunctional ritual for Indian students. Although attempts can be made to integrate them into the mainstream, these attempts appear to fail, either because of different perceptions elsewhere within the higher education system, or within the organization, or because of institutional disincentives.

On a systemic level, Brint and Karabel have pointed out the historical contexts of attempts by major universities such as Sink or Swim to have students who did not fit study elsewhere. In their analysis of higher education shortly after World War I, Brint and Karabel (1989b, p. 207) noted, "Four year colleges, especially the leading ones, already had a generally adequate supply of freshmen and sophomores, and for the most part, they neither wanted nor needed the types of students likely to attend junior colleges." Thus, from a historical perspective, the desire to have American Indian students attend community colleges is nothing new; however, as has been pointed out, over the last 30 years community colleges have been transformed from transfer colleges into primarily vocational institutions. The result is that community colleges such as CCC often no longer see themselves as concerned with the transfer function, even though universities and state officials still rely on that perception.

On an organizational and individual level the conditions for empowerment in which students use, develop, and critique language and beliefs so that they are capable of understanding the means by which their lives are constructed and constrained are absent. Instead, students are taught survival skills, as if going to college is an Outward Bound exercise and only the strong will survive. The ability to produce and criticize meanings, to make knowledge problematic, and to learn about the ideological forces that influence their lives are not concerns of institutions that are trying to make students fit into the mainstream. Again, the purpose is not to paint a picture of evil administrators or faculty out to mold everyone in their likeness and to forget those individuals who are unsuccessful. Rather, the point is to understand what an emancipatory education might look like; in order to do so, one must first come to terms with the received realities that currently exist for individuals in organizations—organizational constraints such as tight budgets, inadequate resources, and assumptions about the functions of education.

Rappaport's (1986) comments on emancipatory schooling are appropriate here:

> There are two keys to success. One is the absolute commitment to an empowerment ideology in *both* language and deed, and the other is a genuine collaboration among the professional community and the members who are viewed, not as clients, but as resources. It contributes to a new culture...that only waits to be released by the proper circumstances. (p. 78)

In general, both "keys" are not present for Native Americans in mainstream institutions. Positive examples exist, such as the English professor at Patchwork. Patchwork's desire to become more involved with American Indian life offers potential and perhaps "the proper circumstances" for empowerment, if it is able to overcome the organizational obstacles that exist.

In the next chapter a discussion ensues about another form of organization—the tribal college—which offers an alternative conception of rituals of integration and assimilation, and, as will be shown, has a different set of organizational obstacles to overcome.

Chapter 6

Tribal Colleges: Dreams Deferred

Bruce Crow Flies High shook his head back and forth and repeated the question, "Why didn't I consider going to a tribal college? Lots of reasons. I guess in your world you'd aspire for the best. You'd want to go to Princeton or Harvard. Well, that's true for me, too. I wanted to go to Patchwork. And the tribal college is isolated. I couldn't get what I want there." Bruce's friend agreed and said, "You can't get a good education there. It's for people who can't do real college work. This is a real college."

Aside from the curious assumption that the "best" for Bruce was to attend Patchwork and the best for a White student was to attend an Ivy League school, Bruce and his friend's comments offer a starting point for a discussion about tribal colleges. The historical and present social contexts of these institutions first needs to be taken into account, so that Bruce's assumption is better understood. The chapter then offers two sketches of tribal colleges and concludes with an analysis of the institutions from a traditional and critical perspective.

CONTEXTUALIZING TRIBAL COLLEGES

As with other aspects of American Indian higher education, until recently very little had been written about tribal colleges (Olivas, 1979, 1982, 1983; Oppelt, 1984). However, with the publication by the Carnegie Foundation of *Tribal Colleges* (1989) and other studies about tribal colleges (Badwound, 1990), interest has increased about their history, scope, and function.

The tribal college movement began in 1968, when the Navajo Nation founded Navajo Community College. Since then, 23 other tribal colleges have been created; they are located in California, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, South Dakota, Washington, and Wisconsin. All of the institutions combined have a full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollment of slightly more than 4,500 students and serve over 10,000 individuals.

Although organizational purposes and characteristics vary from institution to institution, tribal colleges pursue a common, overarching goal: to provide education and training commensurate with tribal aspirations for self-determination. The goal has led to four objectives. First, the colleges provide services to their local communities. In general those communities consist of tribal people on reservations. Second, tribal colleges offer vocational education courses that develop skills for specific jobs. Third, the colleges offer courses geared toward cultural enrichment that reinforce those cultural activities taught at home and by way of tribal ceremonies; and fourth, like other 2-year institutions, the tribal colleges have a curriculum that is geared toward transfer to a 4-year college. Needless to say, the objectives and priorities vary from institution to institution.

Like many community colleges, the typical tribal college charges a low tuition, in keeping with the basic mission of open access for the community. The tax base for these colleges is nonexistent; the tribes do not collect taxes from their citizens, and the state has no formal relationship with the tribe. Instead, building on trust relationships developed with the federal government, the colleges receive a large proportion of their operating funds from Public Law 95-471, the Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act. In the original piece of legislation authorized in 1978, Congress agreed to provide $4,000 for each full-time equivalency.

During the ensuing years two actions have occurred. On the one hand, Congress has agreed in principle to increase the level to $6,000 for each FTE. On the other hand, the appropriations actually have shrunk, so that tribal colleges receive only $1,900/FTE. What Congress appropriates may not be sent to the recipient if the Budget Office decides it must cut funding. Consequently, throughout the 1980s tribal college appropriations have been cut.

For comparison, although precise numbers are not available, it is helpful to realize that public 4-year institutions in states with sizeable Indian populations receive between $6,800 and $11,000/FTE. Public community colleges, where precise figures are available, receive an average of $3,553 per FTE (Badwound, 1990, p. 247). Thus, the poorest 4-year institution receives $5,000 more per full-time equivalency, and a public community college receives $1,700 more per FTE, than any tribal college. Similarly, the average salary for public 4-year institutions in states with sizeable proportions of Native American students is about $32,000; the average faculty salary for tribal colleges is about

$20,000. The vast majority of faculty and administrators at tribal colleges do not hold a doctorate, although many hold master's degrees.

Given these fiscal constraints, the institutions face many obstacles in carrying out their missions. In the Carnegie report Paul Boyer has summarized the situation:

> At almost all of the institutions, salaries are far too low, libraries are shockingly underfunded, and administrators struggle to operate with day-to-day budget constraints that other higher learning institutions would totally reject. Although a few of the colleges have accommodating campuses, many are getting by with mismatched trailers or unsuitable buildings converted from other uses. (1989, p. xi)

These observations point to a remarkable feature of the tribal college movement. As previously noted, many tribes have assumed control over the education of tribal youth. In terms of elementary and secondary schools on Indian reservations, control simply transferred from the BIA to tribes under the auspices of the Indian Self-Determination Act. Along with control, came the funding, facilities, and personnel to operate the schools. Similar options were not open to tribes with regard to postsecondary education. Historically, postsecondary institutions did not exist on Indian reservations. The decision to create such opportunities meant that tribal leaders had to rely entirely on their own initiative. With few resources other than enthusiasm for the task, tribal leaders needed to start their institutions from the ground up. A major challenge to participants has been to acquire adequate financial resources for institutional development.

Fiscal shortfalls and building maintenance present difficult, time-consuming tasks for all college administrators. The problems are exacerbated when funds also do not exist for faculty development, and when institutions are in extremely rural areas that necessitate a great deal of travel for faculty, students, and staff. It is not unheard of for a student to have to travel 100 miles to take a class.

And for institutions that are tribally controlled, an additional dilemma exists: What does it mean to be a tribal college?. Is a tribal community college an institution like any other community college, except that it is governed and staffed by tribal members? In a country that espouses pluralism and integration among the races, is an institution that segregates itself by race a paradox? What are the implications for the structure and pedagogy of an institution that calls itself *tribal*? Or are there no implications?

The most immediate response is that tribal colleges that try to seize a unique role have two challenges. First, no institutional role models exist. A tribal college in South Dakota, for example, cannot look to a similar institution elsewhere to see how governance structures or faculty roles might be defined. Institutions that began in the 1980s sought help from "old" institutions—colleges born in the 1970s. When one looks at other purposive institutions born in the 1960s and 1970s, one discovers that individuals invented the institutions within a historical context. Evergreen State College and Hampshire College, for example, are two purposive institutions whose historical roots in part derive from the University of California, Berkeley, and the philosophy of Alexander Meiklejohn and John Dewey (Jones, 1981). The historical antecedents for tribal colleges, however, are nonexistent.

Even traditionally Black institutions (TBI) have not offered tribal colleges a framework for how to conceive of the institution. Some might argue that a Black institution born in the early 20th century came about for many of the same reasons that tribal colleges came into existence. Black students either were excluded or forgotten in mainstream universities, and the solution was the creation of Black colleges. Yet even though tribal colleges have come about because of similar problems, if they are to emphasize tribal culture, then Black institutions are no more appropriate role models than White colleges. For in general, traditionally Black institutions have replicated mainstream institutions; the purpose of TBIs was to create a dual system that provided Black students with the same advantages that White students received. A Black institution was not necessarily different from a mainstream institution except in the color of the organizational participants.

Tribal colleges, however, initially aspired to a different definition of who they were. Tribal college participants not only wanted to educate their students so that they would reap the economic advantages of a college degree, they also sought to provide an education that reinforced tribal culture and identity. One step in that direction is to have American Indians in positions of authority. Other steps also needed to be taken. In this light, tribal colleges might be more readily compared to some women's institutions more than any other organizational types in academe. Throughout the last 20 years many women's institutions that have not become coeducational have struggled to remake themselves so that they are not merely colleges that happen to serve women; rather, they are women's colleges in structure, pedagogy, and knowledge construction (Tierney, 1989b). Yet even women's institutions had the luxury of their own institutional histories on which to build. Tribal college participants have had to envision their institution as if they were in the process of creating a new organizational type.

A second dilemma faced by tribal colleges pertains to the system in which they reside. How different from the norm can a college be when it must conform to accreditation and funding requirements in order to operate? Postsecondary institutions reflect the ideology of the system in which they exist (Tierney, 1991). As the portraits of Home College and College of the Plains will demonstrate, ideology operates in manifold forms to shape an institution's culture. One example of the kinds of dilemmas that exist for tribal colleges concerns the qualifications of their staff. Accrediting agencies have placed increasing emphasis on academic credentials for college teachers and administrators. Given the paucity of Native Americans with Ph.D.'s, tribal colleges often must turn to White instructors with little or no knowledge of tribal culture in order to meet the requirements of accrediting agencies. How can a college promote tribal identity if its instructors have no sense of that identity? As with any institution, tribal colleges obviously have the choice to forego accreditation so they may hire whomever they desire. The consequences, of course, are that the college's curriculum will not transfer to mainstream universities, and federal funds will be put in jeopardy.

Both dilemmas highlight unresolved problems for Native American educators. A cultural definition of the institution often has been interpreted by individuals such as Bruce Crow Flies High as a deficit model of academe. Students go to tribal colleges who "can't do real college work." The ideological nature of American postsecondary education also has been ill equipped to deal with participants who do not think of their college merely as another type of institution in the diverse quilt of postsecondary education; rather they think of themselves as an entirely different quilt. What follows are portraits of how two tribal colleges have mediated the struggles they face.

A Structure of Possibility: Home College

Background. Home College is located on a reservation with about 10,000 tribal members. Small lakes and rolling hills nourish a variety of trees and vegetation that intersperse the reservation landscape. The extended family is the basis of the social structure. Tribal members maintain strong familial ties; obligations to the extended family take great precedence over other matters. English is the predominant language, although the president of the tribe noted that "the majority of older people are bilingual."

Estimates of unemployment run as high as 60%. Moreover, according to tribal members, alcoholism is a major problem. To combat these difficulties, the tribal government has undertaken various business ventures to provide employment for tribal members. Agencies and programs such as the Indian Health Service and schools also provide intensive counseling and coursework to deal with alcoholism.

The college maintains open admissions, operates on the quarter system, and offers three types of educational programs:

1. Associate of Arts and Associate of Science curricula designed for transfer to 4-year mainstream institutions;
2. Vocational education leading to Associate of Applied Science degrees; and
3. Adult education culminating in GED certificates.

Student enrollment is slightly over 300 FTE per academic year. Roughly 90% of the students are tribal members; the remaining 10% are Whites from surrounding communities and Indians from other tribes. Approximately 90 students attend GED classes each term. Two-thirds of the students are female. The average age of these students is 30, and about one-half are married with children.

Forty percent of the students work on a part-time basis. Most students are eligible for, and receive, financial aid. Slightly less than one-half of the students are high school dropouts who have obtained a GED certificate. Around one-third of the students are recent high school graduates. The majority of entering college students are delinquent in one or more areas of basic skills—reading, writing, and math. Since its inception almost 20 years ago, close to 300 students have earned associate degrees, and around 200 students have received vocational certificates. Around 60 of the associate degree graduates have earned bachelor's degrees from 4-year institutions, and six of these students have completed graduate education.

College facilities consist of seven buildings; the offices and classrooms are small, but they accommodate staff, faculty, and students comfortably. The annual budget is about $1.6 million. The tribal college bill is the primary source of funds, yet it accounts for only 37% of the budget. The college charges minimal student fees—$22 per credit hour for tuition—to maximize educational opportunities for tribal members. The president of the tribe explained, "The area where the college is located is economically depressed. So mechanisms available to other institutions are not available, such as giving to an endowment. There are no alumni with money to give."

External Demands. The current president of the board of trustees—a tribal college member—explained the rationale for establishing the college:

> I'm one of the founding members of the college. We got together in the early '60s. We were aware of the tremendous dropout rates at outside colleges—like 80%. One of the reasons for the college is to provide a

> transition—the freshman and sophomore years here on the reservation—to enable students to adjust to college life before going on. We have our reservation lifestyle—customs, traditions, extended family. When students went to college, they really felt isolated. They couldn't cope with it, so they dropped out and came back home.

Disproportionately high dropout rates of tribal members attending mainstream postsecondary institutions provided impetus to establish a college on the reservation. Activities culminated in the application for and approval of a charter from the tribal government in 1972. A faculty member in her eleventh year of teaching at the college noted how the institution developed under a great deal of skepticism:

> The college has gone through a period of time when it was attacked from all directions. Occasionally we pull out the book (on the college's development). Confidence in the college started right here under shaky circumstances. "It will never work," some said. I think it's unbelievable it's withstood all of that.

Constituents of Home College overcame initial skepticism from local institutions and successfully negotiated a bilateral agreement with a state university for purposes of course certification and administrative support in areas such as student records and financial aid. The institution relied upon their own resources as well as federal programs such as Title IV of the Higher Education Act to fund operations under the agreement. The agreement provided a means for Home College to offer accredited courses until it could achieve its own accreditation. The college achieved candidacy for accreditation in 1978, severed the bilateral agreement in 1979, and achieved accreditation in 1984.

The struggle for accreditation is illustrative of the problems that tribal colleges face. Excerpts from reports of various review teams highlight how participants used the process of accreditation to shape their organizational structure. For example, when the college received candidacy status, the team of outside evaluators expressed a concern:

> The cultural background of many Indian people, including this tribe, does not favor status or class distinctions among their own. The institution must move ultimately toward a more formal structure with patterns of interpersonal relationships defined and accepted in accordance with roles and positions of that structure. Lines of authority and accountability must be well defined not only on paper but also in actual practice.

An interesting question that arises is whether the accrediting agency would have granted the college accreditation if the institution had adopted an organizational structure consistent with tribal beliefs.

Such a structure would downplay "status" and "class distinctions" inherent in formal organizational charts. However, participants at Home College abided by the recommendations of the evaluators. Subsequent accreditation visits produced similar comments. In 1984, for example, the evaluation team suggested that "the college should expedite its current publication of a policy manual, a procedure manual [and] clarify its organizational chart to more adequately identify lines of authority."

Participants at Home College molded a formal organizational structure that satisfied criteria for the accrediting agency, and at the same time tried to create a framework for decision making and community participation modeled on tribal beliefs. The formal structure, then, offers a means to derive organizational goals, but it also constrains the development of informal decision making.

The Organizational Enactment of Tribal Culture. A student at Home College remarked, "I enjoy it here. I know most people. I'm friends with the staff, the administrators." Another student added, "The secretaries and administrators are all helpful. If you knock on their door, they tell you to come in. They help you with your school problems. They explain stuff to you." A third student agreed when he noted:

> I get help from other students with classes, instructors—just about anything I need help with. Also, the financial aid director helps you if you need it. There are also quite a few advisors that you can go to anytime; in fact, I just got done talking to one!

The small size of Home College enables constituents to interact regularly and develop strong personal relationships. Discussions with organizational participants point to a "homelike" organizational atmosphere. One observes constituents interacting regularly through open doors and congregating in the staff and student lounges during breaks. A familial organizational atmosphere is possible because of the small size of the institution, but more importantly it derives from an organizational culture that is an extension of the social structure of the tribal people. The extended family is the basis of this structure; tribal members maintain strong familial ties and obligations to the extended family. The college, then, reflects and is an extension of the culture of the tribe. The homelike institutional atmosphere is the stage upon which constituents of Home College vigorously promote the organization's mission, which is consistent with tribal traditions and expectations.

The mission of the college reads, in part, "To create an environment where the cultural and social heritage of the Indian people can be brought to bear throughout the curriculum." A faculty member noted, "Our mission is to give the students the tools to handle a 4-year college and also teach them about the traditions and cultures of our people." Another faculty member added, "One of our objectives is to bring the culture into classes we teach." A third faculty member agreed by saying, "Our mission is to provide students with the first 2 years of college and then encourage them to go to a 4-year college. One of our goals is to make students aware of their culture."

Home College's mission is to provide students an education that addresses both Western and tribal perceptions of knowledge. The dual mission is evident in observations of classes that range from "principles of biology," where students study blood cells under microscopes, to "tribal history," where students discuss the role of dreams or visions in tribal culture. Implementing the mission is a delicate balancing act. On the one hand, constituents of the college must provide traditional disciplinary courses that will fit into degrees at 4-year colleges and universities. Students need reasonable assurance that the courses they take at Home College will transfer to 4-year institutions they plan to attend. On the other hand, constituents must insure that those same courses provide students with an awareness of their tribal history and culture.

Given the complex task of maintaining tribal identity and providing knowledge and skills for mainstream society, a major concern of the faculty is curricular content. An equally important and related task is the impact of the curriculum on the students. Rather than merely concentrating on cognitive development, faculty concern themselves with the affective development of students. Building "self-esteem" is a major goal of the curriculum at Home College. A faculty member explained:

> One purpose of this college is to give our students a new direction, some hope for a change in their life. They may go back to doing what they're doing, but they have hope. I found this throughout the journals I require them to keep.

Another faculty member expressed similar views:

> Building self-esteem is a big part of our mission to provide education to students. Our students are not used to mainstream education. So in teaching, I not only teach the content of the course, but I concentrate on building their self-worth.

A third faculty member elaborated on how self-esteem makes a difference for students who transfer to mainstream universities:

> It's [Home College] for them [tribal members]. It's a lot easier playing ball at home, interacting with themselves. They build confidence. Students say, "There are people here just like me, with similar kinds of problems and needs." Some of our transfer kids came back and said, "Holy Christ! I was the only Indian guy in that class!" They come here with a lot of fear and leave with a lot of courage.

As previously noted, many entering students at Home College already have dropped out of mainstream postsecondary institutions. Moreover, the majority of entering students are deficient in some area of basic skills. Operating against a backdrop of failure, these students are on the brink of further disillusionment. Consequently, providing students with hope and instilling confidence are primary aims of the educational experience at Home College. Self-esteem is essential in terms of both the student's previous schooling and future educational goals. Faculty consciously strive to develop self-esteem in students, but students also realize confidence as a result of the total Home College experience. "Playing ball at home" is essential to student learning and development.

In keeping with tribal traditions and expectations, organizational participants at Home College promote a learning environment where the success of all students is of primary concern. In doing so, participants enable students to develop strong social bonds with other constituents of the college and thus enhance their chances for success. Success is evident in students' perceptions of organizational life, which characterize the college as "home" and "one big family." A female tribal member who left the university shared her perceptions of the college:

> They're [faculty] willing to lend a hand if you need it. At the university, it was so cold, so competitive. Here, people try to help each other. I feel at home. Like if you have a problem, there are people to help—kind of like a big family. I think that's important for people—to have that attitude of helping people. I'm proud of my heritage. I want to help tribal people deal with school and work toward their future.

Another female tribal member experienced similar views. This student worked most of her life. She obtained her GED, took a leave of absence from her job, and enrolled at Home College:

> When you're a new student, it's really frightening. The instructors are really doing a good job. They reach out to the students. Instructors are open to the students at all times. "If you need help, my door is always

> open," they'll say. They tell you that in class; it's on their syllabus. I'm doing something for my life, being educated to help my people. Someone said this place is a good school; now I know. At a mainstream university you're a number. Here you're a student!

The views of these two individuals are representative of students' perceptions of their learning experiences at Home College. They illustrate the significance of promoting tribal culture and self-esteem. Students speak with renewed optimism and confidence about themselves as human beings. While most students talk partially about their learning experiences at Home College, another student offered a different perspective. This student left the university twice. He is a good student, as demonstrated by his appointment as a peer tutor. He made comparisons between Home College and the university he left:

> The only thing I'm not sure about is if the classes here are hard enough to make you ready when you go away to a university. The classes at the university were a lot more intense. There is more information given every day. There is not any feedback from the teachers. You couldn't even get to the teachers! Here, we're involved with the teachers, the staff. To prepare us to go to a university, I don't know if they should change or just prepare us so we know what to expect when we get down there.

Having experienced student life at the university, this student offered important considerations for Home College's constituents in terms of preparing students to transfer to 4-year mainstream institutions. The student notes that the organizational atmosphere of Home College differs from that of the university:

> They would have to change the whole makeup of this school, but I wouldn't want them to do that. If the atmosphere here was like the university, students would be used to it by the time they get down there. The atmosphere here doesn't prepare you for the real world. Down there, you're a minority. You don't fit in. Here, you're just like everyone else.

According to this student, the homelike organizational atmosphere of Home College is absent at the university. Faculty and students do not interact as they do at Home College. Indian students are in the minority at the university, and social adjustment is a major obstacle to student success. The point is not that the constituents of Home College should replicate the organizational life of the university so that students can "fit in" when they transfer. Instead, what the student suggests is that the constituents of Home College need to consider better linkages that provide for a smooth transition from the tribal college to mainstream postsecondary institutions.

Home College's dilemma is twofold. First, how might the college better enable students to move from their own institution to a mainstream university? Second, how might the formal organizational structure enhance tribal values rather than suppress them? In one sense, it might seem that the successful answer to one question will negate the second question. Before attempting to answer these questions, it will be helpful to consider what options are available to participants to promote tribal culture more vigorously.

A Pedagogy Of Possibility: College of the Plains

Background. College of the Plains is a few hours drive from the nearest city. As cars approach the Plains reservation from the highway, a small sign denotes that the reservation has been entered. As far as the eye can see rolling hills continue; few trees, buildings, towns, or people punctuate the scenery. Unobservant drivers will not even know that they have just entered the Plains Indian reservation. The tribe has over 8,000 members; about three-quarters of them live on the reservation. As with Home College's locale, unemployment on the Plains reservation approaches 80%, and alcoholism and drug abuse are significant results of an economy pillaged by outside business interests.

As with other reservations, tribal politics and family rivalries have produced sharp disagreements about how to solve problems such as unemployment. Members of the tribal council often have been at odds with one another, which has paralyzed tribal government from time to time. And the internecine fighting that occurs on the reservation envelops tribal life to such an extent that all individuals and organizations are swept up in debates and battles about how to resolve particular disputes. One individual commented, "You don't realize how much we're in our own world here." A second person added, "We know what's going on, foreign affairs or in Washington, but it's not active to us. The life of the reservation, who's doing what here, is what matters."

In part, unemployment speaks to the lack of formal educational credentials of the Plains people. Although few businesses exist on the reservation, some economic opportunities are present. The local school system, for example, has 450 positions, but only a third are staffed by local tribal people. Whites staff the remaining positions, because not enough local people have the requisite educational degrees necessary to teach. Salaries are also low on the reservation, and those individuals with college degrees are in high demand; they often receive higher salaries and a better economic standard of living if they move to the city. The consequence of this brain-drain, of course, is that the tribe will not benefit from their insights, knowledge, and technical skills.

External Interpretations. A turn off the highway causes a sharp disjuncture: all of a sudden, low-income housing and old buildings come into view. The college exists in a small town with other tribal offices. At first glance to a visitor, College of the Plains is like no other college. Few signs either on the highway or in town alert the traveler to the College's location. Even when the "campus" is in sight, the neophyte is unaware of its existence. The administration, library, and science program are in an old tribal gym. The basketball court has become the library, and the locker rooms are classrooms. The showers have become additional classes. Down the road a sewage treatment plant has been turned into a science laboratory.

The 8-year-old college has over 200 FTE students. The college offers nine Associate of Arts degree programs and three certificate programs. Over two-thirds of the student body are women in their 30s. The tuition is kept at $20.00/credit hour, because the vast majority of the students are low income. As with countless other small institutions, the staff of the college is skeletal and individuals are called upon to do a multitude of tasks. However, the small staff is not only representative of the dilemmas faced by small colleges but also speaks to the nature of the institution. The president believes that, in keeping with tribal beliefs, a hierarchical structure is an anomaly, and that the little income that exists for the institution should be spent on instruction-related activities. A tribal member, Jane Horn, has been president of the college for 8 years. In keeping with her view that the college's structure should reflect tribal values, her salary of approximately $22,000 is the same as the faculty's. The idea is that all roles in the community are of equal value in contribution. The self-study for accreditation explains why:

> Our value system is represented in the college structure in many forms. Student activities frequently have a family focus. Elder clansmen and clanswomen are integrally involved in moments of achievement. Consensus building is a consistent means of decision making. Forgiveness is employed in grading and withdrawal. Students are encouraged to learn in cooperative groups. Individual student enrollment is accepted by college staff as a family function, counseling and retention strategies are designed in that light.

As with Home College, Horn's desire for an institution that reflects and accentuates tribal culture has run into trouble with accreditation agencies that are more familiar with formalized lines of decision making that exist in pyramid fashion. Accreditation reports have called on her to give herself a salary more in line with traditional presidents' income, but Jane Horn has resisted. Her philosophy runs throughout the institution and her thoughts are instructive about how one shapes the institution toward tribal integrity and culture. She commented:

> Until we've maintained accreditation we'll never make it, but we don't want to lose who we are. We have a low tuition because our people can't afford paying for school. I've been there, and I know that the cost for a course is taking money out of something—out of food, out of kids' clothing, out of something else that is just as essential. The accrediting agency tells us that we're breeding irresponsibility by doing that. Because we have a flat schedule and everyone is paid the same, I'm told I'm not being a good administrator. They don't understand what a college in this society means.

Enacting a Critical Pedagogy. Although an organization's structure certainly impacts on "what a college in this society means," Horn's idea essentially revolves around the institution's pedagogy and its definition of knowledge. Rather than concentrate on the organization's structure, the college's participants have focused on its curriculum. The faculty–student ratio is about 1 to 12. From a tribal perspective the goal of life is to live in harmony with others in society and in nature. The point is not merely to merge pieces of tribal culture into different aspects of the curriculum. From a tribal perspective Western concepts of education have fragmented and divided knowledge. The traditional Indian view is that all knowledge must be integrated into a perspective that promotes the development of harmonious relationships with the individual in the social and natural environment (McNeley, 1988).

The goal of education, then, is not on skill development but on spiritual understanding. Badwound (1990, p. 218) notes that a curriculum that emphasizes a tribal view of knowledge has an "emphasis on humanism, rather than on materialism. 'To be poor' means to be devoid of tribal knowledge imbedded in stories, teachings, songs, and prayers." Such a conception of knowledge obviously necessitates a different structure than those of standard Western organizations; more importantly, perhaps, the pedagogy also will differ.

"We make math as warm and fuzzy as possible," noted the chair of the Math Department. "Anything that gives a student a chance to fail is withdrawn from the program." Another individual commented how "most science tests are open book. Memorization isn't what we want." A third instructor agreed, "I believe education is an active process. Students have to be involved. Students haven't done math or science for

10 years, and then they come here. We have to engage them and help them realize that what they are learning is not alien to them. That they have the knowledge to learn."

The ability to learn revolves around the pedagogical structures the institution has devised. One facet of learning is that instruction often takes place in the tribal language. On Plains reservation a majority of the tribal members speak their own language, oftentimes as a first tongue. As one walks around the college it is common to hear the tribal language spoken. In a bilingual early childhood class, three students commented on how their class functioned:

Student #1: I have a hard time studying, reading the textbook. The language is difficult, but I can come in here and Marge [the teacher] will explain it.

Student #2: We switch back and forth in class. Sometimes we can't seem to explain ourselves in English, and we switch to our own language.

Student #1: The opposite happens, too. We move to English, because our language can't explain a concept.

Student #3: I went to a university, but I didn't last. I tried twice. It cost a lot, that was one problem. But it was also that I couldn't go to talk to teachers.

Student #1: I know the teachers here. They may be family, or I grew up with them. It's that I know them, and they know me.

Student #3: I also was embarrassed at the university because of my age. I felt so much older than everybody. Here I fit right in.

The students' comments certainly pertain to life at a tribal college, but the comments also speak to larger issues that other constituencies and institutions face. The inability to talk to university instructors is an issue that has been much discussed in the higher education literature over the last decade. Adult students in general speak of the difficult times they have when they return to academe. And many students who speak a language other than English often find college life difficult.

What differs with tribal college students, however, is that the full context of their educational experience is framed in cultural attitudes and norms rather than in merely decontextualized techniques for good teaching. The philosophy of the institution gets played out in pedagogical actions. That is, mainstream universities have recognized the challenges adult students face when they return to school, and they have added an office to accommodate those students; little else at the institution will change. The adult student will still face the same organizational and curricular structures. At College of the Plains, however, the entire institution is geared toward a cultural definition of what learning entails and how knowledge is defined. "Learning must flow from the desire of the community as expressed in the philosophy, translated in the mission of the institution, and formulated in courses and lessons," states Indian educator Herbert Benally (1988, p. 11). "This is the natural conduit for desired learning. The lessons must carry out the mission of the institution." The president elaborated:

> I don't care what we look like, the buildings. The heart of the enterprise is the people. Some of our best teaching is done in places with terrible facilities. We constantly struggle to have effective collaboration, to seek interrelatedness. Families come in here. Everybody's got a role. Ceremonies occur. Universities that teach about Indians think of us as history. We use that history. It's not dead, it's alive, living, growing.

Such a philosophy necessitates that all of the organization's participants understand and adhere to the culture of the institution. Again, a problem arises with regard to accreditation and the location of the college. Many White faculty teach at the college; when they arrive, some instructors have no knowledge about the college. "The logic of having non-Indian speakers as teachers flies in the face of what this institution is about," admitted one individual. The Native American Studies instructor went one step further: "We must hire more native people on the faculty. I mean nativists, not assimilationists. Do you speak the language? Do you sing, dance, use the sweat lodge, pipe ceremonies? Do you participate in clan ways? Or do you just watch?" A third person continued, "We need practitioners of the culture, local people." One might argue that, to be an effective instructor of college algebra, it is not necessary to be involved in a "sweat lodge" or "pipe ceremonies," but the individuals' comments must not be dismissed if one is concerned about the potential for students becoming critical citizens engaged in empowering themselves. Nor should the assumption be made that the speakers are merely concerned with White teachers understanding tribal culture, as if it is simply a checklist of cultural exhibits that one needs to know. Indeed, if this were the case, learning for faculty would be little more than what the college has rejected for its students—memorization of static facts. Instead, the speakers' point is that learning takes place in specific contexts and locales, and that those who presume to teach without an understanding of those contexts, without an understanding of the culture of the students, will deny the self-referential aspect of teaching that is central to a student's success.

In addition, the college is isolated and pays low salaries. The math instructor, who is White, observed, "We have to hire Whites, the way it is. I look for people who don't care about money, who don't mind being out here. We've been very lucky." The president continued, "I look for people who have been in the Peace Corps or Vista. Who have some sense of what another culture is like." When White instructors arrive, they are strongly encouraged to take Indian studies classes and to learn the language. The incentive system, then, for faculty development looks inward, toward the basic philosophy of the institution, rather than outward toward disciplinary advancement. Rather than sending people off of the reservation to learn what they need to know to be competent faculty, the institution encourages people to stay on the reservation and learn more from the local people. In effect, teachers become learners, and quite often learners become teachers; the status differential between teacher and learner is reduced, if not eliminated.

Ironically, the problems with such a pedagogy turn on Bruce Crow Flies High's comments at the beginning of the chapter. "They don't give grades at Plains," complained a faculty member at a mainstream university. "The students think they can do college work here, when they can't." Another individual at a university pointed out, "I won't say what happens there is good or bad. But I went out there once. I saw their buildings. Maybe their courses help students who just want a degree from there, but I bet it's tough coming here." A third individual, relatively knowledgeable about the college, pointed out, "Some students get money from one agency or another to take classes. I know they need the money to survive. But it's also odd. They look on taking classes like a job. It's not an educational experience, at least not one that I'm entirely comfortable with." Thus, Bruce and his friend's comments are shared by other members of university communities, which in turn exacerbates the transfer function. Simply stated, if a group at one end of the transfer process does not trust the other group, then those who are transferred—Indian students, in this case—will not move from one system to another in a smooth fashion. How does a system maintain its pedagogic thrust while at the same time ameliorate differences with a radically different system?

The problem, of course, is accentuated due to Plains' lack of funds. "If the government would give us what they're supposed to," suggested Jane Horn, "we could turn our attention to other things. But they don't. We're always scrambling for funds, and that can totally change what you want to do. You do what you need to do to get money, irrespective of your mission. That's not right." One person raised his voice to be heard because of the hammering by carpenters who were transforming a room, "Physical plant money would be nice. A decent place to teach."

Analysis

The struggles at College of the Plains speak to an institution that has a unique philosophy exemplified pedagogically, and constrained by the organization's structural requirements. Herbert Benally summarizes what the pedagogical goals are for an institution such as Plains:

> 1. Students will have the opportunity to become more aware of themselves, particularly with respect to their words, actions, and thoughts towards themselves, one another, and the world around them.
> 2. The student will develop a basis from which he or she will be able to think seriously and responsibly about his or her life, and which will prompt the search for wisdom throughout life.
> 3. Students will be given the opportunity to learn the values and customs of their people, especially as they are expressed in the oral tradition. Through their studies, they may develop an appreciation and respect for the wisdom that has been passed down to them from the ancient people, so that they may in turn pass it on to their children. (1988, p. 12)

Such goals run into obvious confrontation in a Western system of higher education. A Western organization of knowledge is not concerned with the sense of history and ceremony that Benally calls for above. Students at mainstream universities such as Patchwork and Sink or Swim are supposed to be able to "think seriously and responsibly," yet such thought is most often found outside the learner. In contrast, Indian education at Plains reduces the hierarchy between knowledge and the learner, and students are taught to look inward rather than outward. Students learn to conceive of knowledge as something that they create out of their past traditions, rather than to think of knowledge as a body of facts that must be memorized and categorized.

To attain the desired state of knowledge, College of the Plains has developed a natural flow in its curriculum and pedagogy. Course descriptions, course objectives, course outlines, the grading system, and a host of other cultural artifacts derive from, and reflect, the world of the people themselves. The point is not to reject Western science, but to take Western concepts of knowledge and mold them into a native framework so that it aids the culture of the tribe rather than detracts from it.

Most tribal colleges operate in environments quite similar to that of Home College and College of the Plains. Reservation life is dominated and enriched by the extended family and a concern for familial bonds and obligations. As Badwound (1990, p. 244) notes, "These familial ties determine how students negotiate their collegiate experiences, and in turn how administrators, faculty members, and support staff organize and perform their duties within the institutions." Yet the cultural actions of the organization also take place within the political framework of Federal-Indian policies, and the ideological framework of higher education. Federal money supports tribal colleges, and funds for state appropriations or tax dollars are unavailable. Accreditation agencies and mainstream institutions help determine the nature of the institution. Evaluating teams for accreditation shape organizational life.

When the tribal college movement began in the 1960s, the dream was that students would succeed in cultural settings so that they could one day lead their people. Tribal colleges would replace the failure students faced at mainstream institutions with a model of cultural integrity and success. In some respects simply that these institutions have survived is a signal of success. And the dream of an institution that is founded on tribal culture and mores remains. The dreams of students, too, remain. Dreams have not been denied as they have been in universities, but they also have not been fulfilled; rather, students' dreams have been deferred.

What it means to be a tribal college has not been defined. Home College offers a glimpse of how an organization's structure reflects tribal culture, and College of the Plains provides a portrait of a pedagogy radically different from that of Sink or Swim's efforts at mainstreaming. Until tribal colleges came into existence curriculum development had been one-sided. Western thinking permeated educational efforts. First, educators tried to assimilate American Indians by denying native history, language, and culture. A second, more recent, effort by educators has been to use tribal culture as a means to incorporate individuals into the mainstream; tribal culture itself was not so important as was the ability of culture to serve as a vehicle for reaching the goal of assimilation. A third educational attempt has been to try to utilize tribal knowledge as an end in itself, but the pedagogical manner in which the knowledge is delivered has remained essentially Western.

Tribal colleges are trying an alternative route. Like the third attempt, tribal educators have tried to place tribal culture at the center of learning. However, as pointed out at College of the Plains, pedagogy differs from mainstream attempts. Tribal language is highlighted. Cooperation, as opposed to competition, is held in high esteem. Grades and formalized tests are downplayed. Teachers are accessible, and the distinction between teacher and learner is lessened.

Tremendous hurdles, however, must be overcome, hurdles that cannot be overlooked. Students at tribal colleges often start out with educational disadvantages. They may be older students who have not looked at a school book in a dozen years, and their high school experiences were probably poor. Their lives outside school may be incredibly busy and stressful. Their economic situation is almost never settled. When students transfer from the tribal college to a university, they often face the same kinds of problems that students without a tribal college degree encounter: isolation, academic deficiencies and an inability to incorporate their cultural lives into the social life of the institution.

A traditional analysis of tribal colleges would try to determine whether students who go to a tribal college do better than those who do not go. Do students who complete 2- and 4-year degrees have a better chance if they initially attend a tribal college? A multitude of such questions can be asked, yet from a critical perspective those questions are unhelpful. Similarly, Tinto might argue that tribal colleges verify his model, because the portraits of Home College and College of the Plains offer examples of academic and social integration. Again, a critical analysis would disagree with the assumption that tribal colleges are replicating Tinto's model. Tribal colleges are not trying to move people from a previous culture to another one; instead, the colleges are trying to maintain and affirm the culture from which the students come.

From a critical perspective tribal colleges have embarked on a journey that remains undefined. To raise questions about the effectiveness of a tribal college's transfer policies as if institutional success hinges on such transfer misses what tribal colleges are struggling to enact. Once again, the point is not that tribal leaders should be unconcerned about whether students are successful in mainstream institutions; however, the manner in which questions are framed quite often determines the outcome. If accrediting agencies, for example, ask what an organization's formal structure of decision making is, then the organizational participants will respond with a formalized chart. Tribal colleges are trying to develop alternative means to educate their people. Nevertheless, Bruce Crow Flies High's perception of tribal colleges remains. Rather then regress thought onto a western model of education, strategies need to be developed that enhance tribal values and help redefine Bruce's perception of "a real college." A discussion of these strategies will take place in Part Three.

Part III

The Power of the Powerless

Two tasks remain. The data that has been presented in Part Two needs to be united with the theoretical notions discussed in the first part. Specifically, now that the lives of Indian students in academe have been portrayed, a clearer delineation of what critical theory implies for students and postsecondary institutions is warranted. What might a ritual of empowerment look like, and how might it be enacted? What stance might teachers take to engage students critically? How might organizational participants reformulate postsecondary environments so that Indian students undergo rituals of empowerment instead of rites of integration? Chapter 7 offers a theoretical discussion of these questions, while Chapter 8 attempts to answer them in a manner consistent with the critical stance developed throughout the book.

In particular, Chapter 7 undertakes a discussion of three concepts. Given the argument that organizations are cultural constructions that define organizational relationships and knowledge, the chapter first analyzes the "culture of power" that exists in academe and demonstrates how it muffles the dreams of Indian students. The chapter then offers an analysis of how emancipatory forms of authority enable the voices of American Indian students to be developed and heard. The chapter concludes with a discussion of rituals of empowerment.

Chapter 8 parallels the preceding chapter and offers suggestions about how different constituencies might first reformulate the "culture of power," then construct alternative forms of authority, and finally develop a culturally responsive pedagogy that empowers rather than disables. State officials, administrative leaders, faculty, and students are the constituencies addressed in the chapter.

Chapter 7

The Politics of Hope

Toward the end of Salman Rushdie's (1982) remarkable novel, *Midnight's Children*, the troubled narrator enters into an etymological discussion that is also pertinent for a book about minority students in academe. Rushdie writes:

> Ectomy (from, I suppose, the Greek): a cutting out. To which medical science adds a number of prefixes: appendectomy tonsillectomy mastectomy vasectomy hysterectomy. [I] would like to donate one further item, free gratis and for nothing, to this catalogue of excisions; it is, however, a term which properly belongs to history... Sperectomy: the draining-out of hope. (p. 521)

Sperare is Latin: to hope. The history of American Indian involvement in higher education has indeed been a "draining-out of hope." Native American students and their families have seen their hopes and dreams shattered by collegiate institutions that have either ignored Indian students or sought to remake them into a different people. To continue with the integrationists' metaphor of a "pipeline," what we have seen when students enter academe is a continual "draining-out"—both of students leaving college and of hopes denied.

This chapter offers an antidote. Rather than a draining-out of hope, the chapter develops a cultural politics of hope. In doing so, the chapter seeks to lessen the theoretical abstraction of critical theory by delineating specific structures a critical stance assumes for those whose voices are silenced, such as Native American college students.

Like Rushdie's etymological term—*sperectomy*—"cultural politics" also has a historical context. Consequently, the first section outlines the historical relations within which a cultural politics operates in academe in general and with regard to minority students in particular.

145

The argument here is that, to refashion postsecondary organizations and policies, one must first come to terms with the historical and social contexts in which these organizations exist. The second section considers how authority and pedagogy might be reconceptualized to incorporate a politics of difference and emancipation. In the third section the chapter concludes with a reiteration of what rituals of empowerment might entail.

CULTURAL POLITICS

A critical analysis of academe rejects the notion that knowledge and the contexts in which it is embedded are either static or neutral. That is, the creation and production of knowledge is always transitory, recreated by the participants of the organization dialectically with the socioeconomic forces that help determine the ideologies of the institution. Of consequence, knowledge can not be neutral; instead, it is power-laden and dependent upon cultural definitions. Such an interpretation stands in stark contrast to the integrationist perspective. The work of Lisa Delpit (1986, 1988) is helpful in defining a social integrationist analysis of "cultural politics." As Tinto's work has been of assistance in understanding mainstream integrationist assumptions about organizational responses to college going, so too are Delpit's analyses helpful in unearthing an integrationist perspective on pedagogy, power, and authority, which in turn, offers the sketches for a critical portrait of the cultural politics at work in academe.

Delpit has commented that a "culture of power" operates in educational institutions so that "there are codes or rules for participating in power...and the rules of the culture of power are a reflection of the rules of the culture of those who have power" (1988, p. 282). From this perspective the parameters of what institutional participants deem important are power-based cultural constructions. In essence, those individuals in power have defined organizational reality; to gain power, one must be able to interpret the organization's culture.

Delpit's argument is, in part, persuasive in light of the Indian students who attended the different colleges and universities portrayed in Chapters 4 and 5. One student commented how she did not realize she had to register for classes; another student, Sheri Yellowbird, took classes that all met in the same room. Angela Smith and Lila Hyden felt so intimidated by their institution that they fled the campus whenever they were not in class. Each of these examples highlights students who are not keyed into the culture of the institution, and in turn are disabled because of it.

In some respects to argue that institutions have cultural codes that different individuals or groups will be unfamiliar with is an assertion that few people will find surprising or controversial. Indeed, college student affairs staff have arranged summer institutes precisely to initiate students to the culture of the institution. Countless institutions have campus tours or a one-credit course to help the beginning student. The problem with Delpit's analysis, however, is that she has not fully interrogated how power operates in an organization or considered power's relationship to knowledge production. Delpit has reduced cultural differences to merely different learning styles: one group of students learns one way, and another group of students learns another way. From this perspective, the task of the educator is to orient the disabled to the correct way to learn, so they too may participate in the culture of power.

The point here is not to denigrate the research of social integrationists such as Delpit, but to extend their work further. To the extent that educators acknowledge that culture and power are linked is a crucial understanding for those who want to change academe. Such an insight forces educators to investigate the most microscopic of activities in higher education in order to come to terms with how cultural artifacts, codes, and symbols operate to disable different groups.

The problem for critical theorists, however, arises with the resulting analysis and implications when power is not conceptualized more fully, more completely. "If you are not already a participant in the culture of power, being told explicitly the rules of that culture makes acquiring power easier," argues Delpit (1988, p. 282). The strategies, then, are instrumental in nature and in effect collapse power into a role-related concept. Some people are not in power, and for them to be put in power, they must understand the "rules." Teachers must have high standards, demand excellence, and make explicit what is expected of students. Without arguing with any of these assumptions, a critical stance directs attention in an entirely different manner, for the simple reason that critical theorists seek to fundamentally transform the "culture of power" rather than recreate and reinforce the present relations of power. To do so, critical theorists explicitly link relations of power to concepts such as knowledge and authority, whereas the social integrationist definition of knowledge and authority is more implicit, more embedded.

Knowledge, for example, may be thought of in three ways: knowledge *that*, *how*, and *to* (Apple & Jungck, 1990, p. 233). Knowledge *that* pertains to factual information such as that the day to register for classes is August 15, or that Charles Dickens wrote *A Tale of Two Cities*. Knowledge *how* is skill development, so that students know how to use the computer to preregister for classes or how to use the library to locate references about the life of Charles Dickens. Knowledge *to* is what critical theorists call *dispositional knowledge*, such as the values and ethic that guide life in community. What it means *to* be a member of a democracy, or *to* work for social justice, or *to* understand one's racial heritage are examples of dispositional knowledge.

The structure of postsecondary organizations and the educational life of students is primarily geared toward strategies that enhance understandings pertaining to "knowledge that" and to a certain extent "knowledge how." Students are told that they must understand factual information if they are to succeed. Statewide assessment measures or college entrance exams such as the SAT and ACT are examples of the importance the higher education community places on standardized criteria of knowledge. Colleges and universities also have structured their organizations so that students are able to learn factual knowledge. Some individuals, such as Delpit and Tinto, have argued that educators must develop strategies that are culturally responsive; yet the strategies proposed entail a pedagogy largely framed for educating students about "knowledge what" and "knowledge to." Summer school programs, learning laboratories, remedial tutors, and a host of other pedagogic aids aim to increase minority students' facility to learn essential facts and concepts. Again, the underlying philosophy of this position is that students must grasp hold of the "culture of the power," by way of learning strategies that enable all students to learn similar facts.

To be sure, a liberal orientation has suggested that some facts need to be changed. What has come to be called the curricular *canon* in higher education has come under attack because women and people of color have been excluded. Academe's response has been to include an author here or there who is a woman or is a person of color. Yet again, the assumption at work is that facts still exist that need to be learned; a different era simply necessitates learning different facts. The underpinnings of what is conceived as knowledge, however, remains the same, and what it means to be educated still entails understanding particular facts so that one may fully participate in the "culture of power."

Other than conservative idealogues such as Allan Bloom or William Bennett, few will argue that including people of color and women into curricular canons is mistaken or should not be done. The problem arises with regard to the emphases that these debates have taken and the absence of a discussion around the deeper meaning of knowledge and power. Liberals have emphasized the need to change the canon and have neglected to consider what a canon means. The failure of this approach is that it is based on a notion of shared moral values that does not bring into question how those values are defined; in essence, students are never taught to become critically engaged with dispositional knowledge. Although students may be taught the facts of their native pasts, the emphasis is never on the structural and ideological relationships of those facts to the larger society.

Some individuals argue that the acquisition of dispositional knowledge is indeed important but that students are ill-equipped to comprehend abstractions such as *justice* or *democracy* until they have acquired prior skills. Such an assertion is commonplace in the structure of the academy's curriculum. The curriculum that Fanny James and countless other college freshmen encounter when they enter college is predicated on the assumption that students first need to learn the "basics." Presumably, the manner in which one learns facts is relatively unimportant; what must be drilled into students is that they learn particular facts. Eventually, large lecture classes and multiple choice exams give way to smaller classes and essays. Finally, in a student's senior year he or she is able to participate in seminars where a degree of autonomy is supposed to exist and students might begin to deal with dispositional knowledge. Yet researchers have found that even senior year seminars are often simply lectures with small groups of students rather than large groups (Tierney, 1989b). Discussions about abstract values do not take place; instead, students discover another version of knowledge—the discipline—and the assumption remains that they must learn the basic facts of the major before they are able to participate in more abstract discussions.

The implications for the relationship between teacher and student is clear. The teacher is a knowledge expert, and the student is uninformed, with little to offer in any pedagogic encounter. By their assumptions about the "culture of power," integrationists reinforce the belief that students are not equal participants in their education. From a liberal integrationist stance, the effective teacher needs to understand that all students are not alike and that different students have different learning abilities and needs. However, the essential authority of the teacher remains, because the underlying framework of knowledge and power has neither been investigated nor challenged.

The inherent assumption from which educational organizations, pedagogies, and curriculum derive is that ultimate truths exist irrespective of time, context, or personalities. The rationalist ideal is based on the uninterrogated idea that a single, universal ontological reality exists, and that there is a single substantive idea of the common good with which all will agree. Such a position is essentialist in nature and in fundamental disagreement with a critical conceptualization of democracy and society.

The implications for American Indian participation in higher education are clear. Indian students such as Johnny Ortiz or Clinton Bennett come to academe disadvantaged and ill equipped to succeed in the "culture of power." Their pasts are either ignored or viewed as static components of a disembodied history that has little relation either to their own lives or to the lives of their people. College professors are trained to teach about the knowledge that they possess; because of the knowledge explosion, professors feel compelled to stay current in their own disciplines; they have little time to inquire about culturally specific pedagogies needed to teach Indian students. And for those individuals who do try to implement alternative learning strategies, the ultimate goal remains the same—to provide an effective process whereby students will learn specific data. Further, the vast majority of Indian students leave college during their first 2 years; those years are the moments when students have the least opportunity to inquire about dispositional knowledge. Large, impersonal classes are the norm and the hierarchical nature between teacher and student is most severe.

Participants at institutions such as Sink or Swim find a disincentive to become involved with Native Americans. The organization has defined knowledge and pedagogy in a manner consistent with what has been discussed above. Although the participants at Patchwork University have tried to come to terms with how they might enable students to learn more effectively the culture of the institution, their essential mission parallels that of Sink or Swim. City Community College has a different conception of knowledge, one that is more vocational and less philosophic, but its approach to knowledge is akin to that of the other two institutions: The teacher is the knowledge expert, and the student attends the institution to learn facts that will lead to gainful employment.

The two tribal colleges have taken different paths. Home College is similar to City Community College, but its pedagogy and philosophy are entirely different. Home College has bought into Delpit's idea that one purpose of education is to orient students to the mechanisms of power so that they will learn more effectively; presumably, the intent is also to enable students to transfer and graduate from a mainstream institution. College of the Plains has an entirely different philosophy. The participants begin from a different conception of knowledge and consequently conceive of teaching and students in a manner much closer to critical interpretations of academe. The next section outlines what those conceptions are; however, one larger point remains to be made.

All of these institutions, but in particular the tribal colleges, exist in the system of American higher education. Given that the system defines knowledge in a manner consistent with the social integrationist view, articulation agreements, accreditation requirements, program certification, and the like necessarily must fit into an integrationist framework. If an institution agrees with the system-wide definitions and is capable of meeting different requirements, problems will not occur. Difficulties will take place only if an institution such as College of the Plains has an entirely different scheme of what counts for knowledge. The point is relatively straightforward; postsecondary institutions mirror the sociopolitical contexts in which they operate. Opportunities for alternative conceptions of knowledge, power, and pedagogy exist, but individuals and institutions find little encouragement, if not discouragement, to seek out alternative definitions and, in turn, to propound change.

A POLITICS OF DIFFERENCE

Hartsock (1983, p. 90), positing a feminist stance that is also critical, comments, "Theories of power are implicitly theories of community." A critical theory of community reconfigures centrality, margins, borders, and the landscapes of knowledge. The social relations of the community are never fixed and permanent, so that a continual struggle exists to comprehend how the community creates its borders to exclude some and give preference to others. As opposed to an emphasis on factual knowledge, a critical analysis offers preeminence to educational communities devoted to advancing discussions of dispositional knowledge. Static facts or "canons" of knowledge are rejected and instead discussions pertain to how knowledge gets constructed and defined. As Shrewsbury (1987, p. 10) notes, such a reconfiguration perceives "the classroom as a community of learners where there is both autonomy of self and mutuality with others." In this light, power, rather than role related, is viewed as a concept of energy, capacity, and potential. A culture of power, then, seeks to enable students to find their own voices and histories rather than merely learn the rules of community that reinforce unequal relationships.

A point of clarification is crucial here. A critical analysis does not reject the integrationist stance per se but, rather, reverses the emphases that have led to unequal power relationships. In effect, critical theorists argue that integrationist assumptions about the culture of power and the implications for pedagogy are minimalist in nature. Of course minority students should be able to read, write, and communicate as well as anyone else in society. Obviously, people of color and women should be included on reading lists. High standards and a commitment to excellence are the sole property neither of cultural conservatives such as Bloom nor of rigorous liberals such as Delpit.

However, the critical analysis believes that unequal power relationships will not be overcome simply by training people about the rules that have kept the oppressed powerless. As Freire (1970) argues:

> No pedagogy which is truly liberating can remain distant from the oppressed by treating them as unfortunates and by presenting for their emulation models from among the oppressors. The oppressed must be their own example in the struggle for their redemption. (p. 39)

Such an argument has clear implications for the manner in which pedagogy is structured and the way teachers construct their classrooms and conceive of their role. Rather than assume that the student knows nothing, a critical pedagogy begins by accepting students as colearners who have much to contribute to the learning process. In effect, the focus of a community's education revolves around discussions of dispositional knowledge, and students become developers of the pedagogy instead of simply passive recipients.

Another point of clarification is necessary. Liberals also have called for students to become "involved" in their learning (Boyer, 1987; Association of American Colleges, 1985; Mortimer, 1984). The liberal interpretation of involvement, however, is entirely different from the idea advanced here. A student's involvement in learning, from a liberal perspective, simply assumes that one form of pedagogy is better than another, that students who become engaged in their classrooms are more likely to do better than students who do not become involved. Again, any critical theorist will agree that students should be involved in their learning, but a critical notion extends the concept even further. Students do not simply receive a different form of pedagogy, but the concept of what it means to be a student and teacher is reformulated. The authority of the teacher is lessened, and the voice of the student becomes central.

Of consequence, large lecture classes, and multiple choice exams that act to certify and deny, are rejected. Learning needs to take place dialogically. The teacher is no longer a knowledge expert who seeks to exert authority over those who do not have access to the same facts as the teacher. Again, Freire is helpful:

> Those who authentically commit themselves to the people must reexamine themselves constantly....To affirm this commitment but to consider oneself the proprietor of revolutionary wisdom—which must then be given to (or imposed on) the people—is to retain the old ways. The [individual] who proclaims devotion to the cause of liberation yet is unable to enter into communion with the people whom are still regarded as totally ignorant, is grievously self-deceived. (1970, p. 47)

The self-deception that Freire highlights pertains to how teachers clarify the nature of their appeals to authority. Again, often the assumption has been that a radical view of education has rejected calls for excellence and effectiveness in schooling. By implication, radical educators seek to implement mediocre standards and a classroom environment that offers few of the life skills necessary for gainful employment. Such an argument overlooks one of the essential points of critical pedagogy. Educators are concerned with individual achievement and some of the traditional forms of academic success, but they also are concerned with linking that achievement and success to the concept of social transformation. As Giroux (1986, p. 30) notes, "Teaching for social transformation means educating students to take risks and to struggle within ongoing relations of power in order to be able to alter the grounds on which life is lived."

Portraits of "teaching for social transformation" were mostly absent from the experiences of the American Indian students. However, two examples are worth reconsidering. The first sketch pertains to the young English professor at Patchwork University discussed in Chapter 5. She was an outsider to the area, and, when she arrived, "I made as many trips to the reservation schools as possible. I listened to as many people as I could." She reduced the size of the English classes, doubled the number of hours for the classes, and tripled the reading and writing assignments. Rather than slow the pace of learning, the teacher speeded it up.

Her assumption was that, as the instructor, she needed to understand the lives of students; by her trips to the reservation and her involvement with students outside of the classroom, she exhibited what Freire would call an "ability to enter into communion with the people." As the instructor commented, "I believe they know more than I. I know about teaching English, but to implement it, to get it going, I had to turn to those who know and they taught me a lot." Importantly, the English teacher saw her task as more than simply keying students into the culture of power. She understood power relations in a manner fundamentally different from that of the social integrationists. To be sure, her reading lists were culturally relevant and her standards were demanding. What set her apart from social integrationist concepts was her belief that she needed to reduce the status hierarchy between teacher and student, and that transformation needed to take place as much within herself as within the student. The teacher was no longer viewed as a knowledge expert, but rather as a co-learner. The learning that took place began with discussions that pertained to the lives of the students. Writing assignments, readings, classroom discussions, and a multitude of other pedagogic encounters all revolved around the specific contexts from which students came. Teaching assistants reflected gender and ethnic diversity.

Further, her pedagogic experiment came about because remedial classes, summer programs, and the like had not been successful in moving students into the mainstream. In one form or another, programs geared to teach students how to operate in the culture had failed. Her attempt by the end of the academic year succeeded in raising reading levels and enabling students to move into a succession of higher level classes. No one would claim that the effort of this individual involved loose standards or a watered-down curriculum. The argument, however, that might be offered is that the classes were too expensive. Obviously, a 12 to 1 student-teacher ratio costs more than a freshman English class with 40 to 50 students and one teacher. Her response bears reiteration: "They say it's not cost efficient. I ask them if it's cost efficient for students to take remedial English over and over again. Or if it's cost efficient to lose students, or if it's efficient to have students who can't read."

This individual has entered into a dialogue with minority students, those who are marginal to the community of Patchwork University. The manner in which she has reshaped her classroom is not a call to reemphasize the authority of the teacher; rather, she has brought into question the nature of knowledge and learning. In this light, one individual has struggled to create a context for teaching dispositional knowledge that at the same time teaches students skills and facts. The problem for the individual is that she works in an environment that is not supportive of such experiments. As noted, Patchwork is certainly more amenable to different strategies—hence the name *Patchwork*—than Sink or Swim's organizational climate. However, postsecondary organizations are not arranged to create climates for learning such as the one the English teacher has implemented.

As an organization, College of the Plains has made a conscious effort in the direction that Patchwork's English professor has attempted. The "culture of power" at the College is fundamentally different from the other institutions mentioned in the study. Learning takes place in cooperative groups and criteria such as grading and withdrawal are deemphasized. Assessment is peripheral rather than central to the life of the college. Students are seen as intimately connected to their families, so that counseling is a family function instead of an individual one. Badwound (1990) pointed out how tribal college participants define *poverty* as someone who is devoid of what critical theorists claim is dispositional knowledge—cultural knowledge which is embedded in stories, songs, and prayer. Pedagogy and learning encourage students to look inward so that they might come to grips with their own lives and histories. Echoing Lipka (1989, p. 216), tribal colleges "view the community not as a resource to the school, but the school as a resource to the community." Community-based learning, then, is not merely training for jobs, but also educating students about the cultures of their past so that these cultures may be maintained and strengthened in the future.

As noted, tribal colleges face, on a systemic level, what the English professor faces within her organization. Accrediting agencies and the like often are hostile or misinterpret activities at College of the Plains. Instead of seeking institutions that follow radically different notions of the construction of knowledge and pedagogy, system-wide agencies geared for assessment try to synthesize different formats. The argument, of course, will be made that accreditation agencies in the United States support greater organizational diversity than virtually any other higher education system in the world; to criticize system-wide agencies on the grounds that they seek uniformity appears misplaced and unfair. To be sure, accrediting and professional societies do deal with a potpourri of colleges and programs in the United States. The point, however, is that a pedagogy such as that at College of the Plains or in the English class at Patchwork University is not simply another flower in the garden of accreditation; it is an entirely different garden these individuals and groups are trying to construct, and system-wide agencies often have an investment in maintaining the status quo.

Once again the argument returns to ultimate goals and beliefs. System-wide assessment measures assume that general agreement will be reached on values and goals. A critical view rejects that idea. As Mouffe (1990, p. 63) points out, "There will always be a debate about the nature of justice in a modern democracy and no final agreement can ever be reached. Democratic politics must accept division and conflict as unavoidable and the reconciliation of rival claims and conflicting interests can only be partial and provisional." From this perspective, the challenge for system-wide agencies, which will be discussed at greater length in Chapter 8, is not to synthesize measures of assessment and accountability, but to configure alternative ways of aiding institutions that have foundationally different views of knowledge and pedagogy such as College of the Plains.

The point, then, for a politics of difference is not to overlook the "culture of power" but to forge a link between power and knowledge. As Foucault argues, the critical intellectual operates simultaneously through the reformulation of consciousness and the reconfiguration of institutions (Lemert & Gillan, 1982, p. 91). Instead of accepting the dynamics of power, as Delpit does, the transformative intellectual attacks the relationships of power wherever they exist—in the classroom, the dynamics of the organization, or the system in which colleges and universities reside. Such an assertion enables everyone to be involved in change, as opposed to investing transformation in the hands of a single or a few heroic organizational leaders, as so often seems the case. Students, teachers, administrators, and state-level bureaucrats all have transformative potential.

What remains to be seen is how that potential might be enacted so that American Indian students have their dreams confirmed rather than denied or deferred. Prior to such a discussion, one final theoretical argument needs to be revisited. The next section reunites the initial discussion pertaining to rituals of empowerment. Simply stated, if an organization assumes a critical stance and seeks to enact a politics of difference and hope, what are the theoretical implications for an understanding of organizational processes that seek to empower?

RITUALS OF EMPOWERMENT

The previous sections have underscored how critical theorists conceive of power in a fundamentally different manner from that of integrationists. Power exists in an organization, but it is not something that is role related or simply a list of issues and topics that one must learn. The role of educators is to translate for the learners the meanings of power. As power is related to culture, the manifold symbols and constructs of culture are investigated in order to determine how power operates. As Fay (1987) notes:

> The process of education…is in part a process of empowerment in which a group of people who do not understand themselves to be such a group gradually discover that they are and gain the will to act in concert. It is because they become empowered that the oppressed can hope to challenge and overcome the power of those who oppress them. (p. 130)

From this perspective power is not only domination but also empowerment. Power is dyadic. It invokes meanings for the powerless as well as the powerful. For the researcher the challenge is to develop a portrait whereby individuals and groups might achieve a much clearer picture of who they are and what those social practices are that constrain them from realizing their empowerment; the struggle for educators is to enact the conditions for the powerless to understand and utilize their power. The classroom and the educational organization are viewed as a highly charged ritual that has potential for social transformation.

Thus, if college is a ritual encounter, educators should not try to construct rituals of integration but of empowerment. Instead of integration, a ritual should be one of diversity and conflict. Again, the work of the researcher is to point out the imperative for such a conception, and the work of the teacher is to enable such rituals to take place. A ritual of empowerment is one where the educational process enables students to unearth their subjugated histories and voices, not so that they can assimilate into the system, but so that they will be able to challenge and change it. "Students are transformed," notes McLaren, "when hidden grudges and tensions are mobilized for the purpose of rupturing the culturally axiomatic rules of the school and subverting the grammars of mainstream classroom discourse" (1986, p. 80). Such a view of rituals and schooling clearly orients the discourse of education around dispositional knowledge; such a view is also disquieting in so far as the purpose of education becomes one of the creation of conflict rather than the creation of a unifying discourse. The assumption is that a singular language inevitably excludes those on the margins; of consequence, conflict is inevitable in a system based on rituals of empowerment.

The tension of contradictory impulses becomes evident in rituals of empowerment. The educator tries to bring groups together who have been made to feel that they are outsiders and do not belong in the organization, and at the same time the ritual—as are all rituals—is an act of a community. How can a community have as its core a ritual that seeks to provoke diversity and conflict? The contradictory goal is of a ritual that unites a community in diversity instead of assimilation.

Rituals of empowerment become the processes whereby individuals gain a measure of control over their lives. Teachers do not merely pass on different knowledge forms to individuals, but instead, like the English instructor at Patchwork, create conditions where individuals may empower themselves. The point here is that individuals do not empower others. Empowerment is not given; it is taken. Empowerment is not the learning of specific rules of the "culture of power" because it is a process rooted in social relations and contexts. Rituals of empowerment use the experience of people who have been marginalized to produce an aggressive critique of the prevailing social system.

Because empowered individuals are active, conscious people, they speak out and create demands. Classrooms, organizations, and systems that seek to enable students to become empowered necessarily will encounter disagreements and conflict over the nature of reality of those situations in which they are involved. As Giroux notes, such rituals "offer new epistemologies for rethinking the broader and specific contexts in which democratic authority is defined; it offers... a healthy suspiciousness of all boundary-fixing and the hidden ways in which we subordinate, exclude and marginalize" (1990, p. 17). In this light, the theoretical notion of an educational ritual offers students opportunities to engage multiple references that constitute different cultural codes, experiences, and discourses so that they might see the self-referential nature of knowledge and power.

Of necessity, the theoretical abstraction of what a ritual of empowerment might entail now needs to be addressed. Just as importantly, one must begin such a discussion with the knowledge that constructing rituals of empowerment and educational strategies that call upon experiences of the learner cannot proceed from a laundry list of "how to's." If causal rules do not exist, and lives of the powerless need to be the base from which such rituals and strategies begin, then necessarily, any programs will be flawed that seek to decontextualize actions and learning. Nevertheless, educators do need maps of where to start their processes of construction. As a theorist builds theory out of experiences and contexts, what might an educator do who seeks to create a classroom, organization, or system where empowerment is viewed as the scaffolding for the program?

Chapter 8

Living in Truth

The struggle in this book has been to come to terms with a different theoretical formulation of American Indian participation in academe. The challenge now remains to consider how individuals might act in a critical manner. As McLaughlin (in press) has observed, "Many times, critical theorists' calls for transformative leadership and transformative intellectualism amount to obfuscating rhetoric which, in over-intellectualizing what is wrong with mainstream school practices without identifying what actually teachers and school administrators can do, simply add to the problem." Simply stated, what are the implications of a critical perspective for an administrator, faculty member, or Indian student? Vaclav Havel (1990) is helpful in providing an orientation to the chapter that suggests an answer to the question:

> When I speak of living within the truth I naturally do not have in mind only products of conceptual thought, such as a protest or a letter written by a group of intellectuals. It can be any means by which a person or group revolts against manipulation....If the suppression of the aims of life is a complex process, and if it is based on the multifaceted manipulation of all expressions of life then, by the same token, every free expression of life indirectly threatens the [system]. (p. 59)

Havel's words, written as a political dissent of a totalitarian system, also speaks to a critical perspective in three ways. First, one key point of critical theory is that theory must be linked to action, so that the goal of such theory is the production, not merely of "conceptual thought," but also of action that is meant to bring about change. Second, change should not be conceived as the sole possession of intellectuals or upper level administrators or any other group. All individuals have a role for protest and action in accord with "living within the truth." Indeed, a key component of a critical analysis is enabling the powerless to realize that they are not powerless and that they are able to change the social relations of their existence. Third, change is multifaceted, a "complex process." It comes not only from dramatic reorientations such as the overthrow of a government, but also from more minute developments that an individual may utilize.

This chapter expands on each of these points in two ways. First, the chapter opens with a discussion about how the "culture of power" might be reformulated, and second, the chapter continues by offering specific strategies for a culturally responsive pedagogy based on empowerment instead of integration. The point here is to construct a broad outline that individuals might utilize as they work in their own communities of learning. In this light, the chapter is less instrumental and more strategic. Several works have offered solutions from an instrumentalist perspective (Green, 1989; Bender, 1990; Quality Education for Minority Project, 1990; Newman, 1985). As noted in Chapter 7, the purpose of this book has not been to reject integrationist solutions out of hand, but to reconceptualize them and push their assumptions further. The suggestions that follow, then, derive from the data presented in Part Two and the theoretical formulations of Part One, but these suggestions are not causal variables. Consequently, instead of "cookbook solutions" the chapter offers ways for individuals to think about American Indian participation in academe in order to develop solutions on their own campuses.

ORGANIZATIONS AND THEIR CULTURES

Five points naturally develop from the theoretical suppositions and data that have preceded this chapter. Each point pertains to the interactions between the culture of the organization and the Indian students who attend those institutions, and how cultures change over time.

1. Organizational Adaptation

To be sure, anyone who enters an organization needs to learn its cultural mores and symbols. However, with regard to Native American students, virtually all of higher education's efforts have gone toward integrating Indian students into the system. Academic support centers, student orientation, and summer programs are examples of programs that assume Native American students need to be helped.

The comments from the students point out a different posture that needs to be taken.

Instead of assuming that the student needs to be changed, academe needs to consider how the organization might better adapt to the diversity of its student body. New faculty to the institution, for example, need a formal orientation and socialization to the contexts in which their students reside. From a critical perspective education occurs as a dialogic encounter among all individuals. The teacher is not simply an authority figure, but also someone who has much to learn from students. Culturally specific activities need to be developed and fostered, so that faculty, staff, and administrators have the tools necessary to meet students on their level. And by suggesting that teachers need to meet students "on their level," the portrait must not be painted that Indian students are somehow less adept than others. To the contrary. To encourage teachers to understand the multiple realities at work in an institution is to acknowledge and ultimately celebrate the diversity that counts for American society.

Institutions geographically close to reservations might speak with tribal leaders about how best someone new to the institution could learn about tribal ways. Repeated and consistent interaction with tribal elders, students, and their families offers opportunities for Anglo faculty and staff to learn about a culture uniquely different from their own, and in turn, teach individuals how best to interact with Indian students.

Such visits and interactions must not be developed as empty gestures or merely symbols of goodwill. The point is not to visit an Indian reservation once and never return. To suggest that faculty and staff ought to become bicultural and familiar with the backgrounds and cultures of their students demands much greater commitment than simple tourism would allow. Indeed, the mindset of a tourist who sets out to see "natives" is precisely the opposite of what is desired.

Tribal colleges experience a similar dilemma. Oftentimes Anglo faculty arrive at the institution and have no formal orientation to their students or to reservation life. Faculty need explicit encouragement to become involved in the life of the reservation, and training needs to occur as much for new faculty at tribal colleges as for faculty who work at institutions off of the reservation. Indeed, the challenge of socializing new faculty may be even more imperative at tribal colleges, in so far as virtually the entire student body will be American Indian.

The point here is to highlight the need to socialize faculty to the learning styles and lives of those whom they educate. Obviously, such an action requires time, commitment, and resources. State agencies should be sensitive to the roles they might be able to play in coordinating such actions for all public institutions in their state. The administration of specific institutions need to make clear where their priorities lie. It is no longer good enough to say that faculty should learn about the backgrounds of their students and yet maintain all of the organization's incentives for those who are prolific researchers or are successful at bringing in outside funding. An organization that enhances cultural learning will reward faculty who spend time trying to understand the cultures of their students. Rewards come in a variety of forms. Obviously, an institution that links salary raises to specific actions rewards faculty who work hard at cultural learning. But many institutions where significant numbers of Indian students attend are unable to provide financial incentives other than the most meager of salary hikes. What might these institutions do to encourage faculty to learn more about tribal life?

The president must make clear that the institution is sincerely dedicated to aiding the faculty in the pursuit of cultural learning. Explicit expectations about the goals of the institution are forthcoming. College deans and department chairs have a variety of in-service activities and released-time incentives to offer individuals interested in learning more about cultures different from their own. Faculty respond to positive reinforcement that is genuine. Insincere comments are read most often as just that—insincere. But the college president or dean or department chair or colleague who genuinely expresses appreciation and support goes far in pointing out the values that the community admires.

Cooperative agreements need to be developed for faculty and administrators in tribal colleges and specific off-reservation colleges and universities. To be sure, tribal colleges will benefit from a faculty member who spends a term teaching at the institution, but the faculty member and the university will also benefit from the experience the individual gains while working at the tribal college. State coordinating agencies might develop a more explicit role in the creation of such relationships.

Bilateral in-service activities need to be fostered and developed. Faculty at research universities have specific areas of expertise with regard to disciplinary knowledge that will be of value to tribal college faculty, and tribal college personnel have insight and knowledge that will help socialize the university neophyte to life on the reservation. Relationships between a tribal college and an off-reservation institution need to be fostered, yet such a relationship must be coordinated, structured, and maintained so that everyone is aware of the relationship and utilizes it. Too often such agreements are built in isolation by one individual, and nothing comes of it. Someone, either in the state agency or on both campuses, ought to be assigned specific responsibility for developing a positive working relationship. Such a relationship should be created within a climate that appreciates both institutions as equals with different areas of expertise that need to be shared.

2. Organizational Bridges

States and institutions have focused their efforts on building articulation agreements between 2- and 4-year institutions. As with the academic and social support programs mentioned for Indian students above, such efforts are necessary. It defies logic that a student should take courses at a community college in preparation for a 4-year degree only to find that the courses will not transfer to a 4-year institution. At the same time, an even larger issue needs to be addressed.

Bridges between 2- and 4-year institutions are of no use if no one travels over them. Community colleges, like all institutions, have manifold functions and roles. As with all of American higher education no general rule pertains to every 2-year college. However, a clearer delineation of how institutions are to better serve ethnic minorities needs to be forthcoming from every institution. The suggestion here is that the response, on the part of different institutions, that the "problems" of Indian students may best be solved elsewhere is insufficient. When an institution such as Sink or Swim assumes that City Community College will deal with the problems of one group of students and then proceeds to develop an articulation agreement as if the document itself is the solution to the problem, a misperception exists that, in the end, harms those Indian students who desire a 4-year degree. That is, the community college with which Sink or Swim developed the articulation agreement did not think of itself as a transfer institution; the vast majority of degrees were terminal in nature. And City Community College, by the way, was quite adept at finding jobs for its students. To be sure, those few individuals who want to transfer might be able to do so, because articulation agreements are in place, yet the culture of City Community College mitigates against students who want a 4-year degree.

The point is not that anyone is consciously perpetuating injustices or "cooling out" students, to use a phrase from another era. Still, obvious misperceptions exist about institutional roles. Those who are hurt by the misperceptions are not the administrators, faculty, or staff at these institutions; those hurt are students such as American Indians who desire a 4-year degree. If the culture of a 2-year institution is geared toward vocational certificates, then that is what students will work toward. If the university tells students that, before they will be able to compete at the university, they should attend the community college, then that advice is not sufficient.

Although institutions need to develop clear identities about how they define themselves with regard to curricular initiatives and the like, these identities must not implicitly exclude people on the base of race. A community college that is set up for vocational training, or a public university that emphasizes the liberal arts, or a private college that encourages scientific inquiry—all need to address more straightforwardly how their institutions might more fully incorporate Native Americans into their institutions rather than assume that students who do not meet specific criteria should look elsewhere.

The role for state agencies is of crucial importance here. State education agencies need to encourage, coax, and at times mandate that institutions more clearly address how they will enable minority students such as Native Americans to fully participate in the life of the institution. In order to do so, institutions will need to develop comprehensive strategic plans that have specified timeframes, tasks, and goals tied to them.

Tribal colleges also should strengthen their relationship with a specific institution. Tribal community college students who eventually enter a 4-year institution face the same problem as Indian students who go to the university as freshmen; they face culture shock and alienation. A tribal college education may well be better than what a student finds at a mainstream university, but it does not seem to prepare students any better for the experiences they must undergo when they eventually arrive at the university. One way to ameliorate such problems is to strengthen the relationships between the tribal college and a nearby university. Field trips, seminars, and discussions with faculty and student service personnel and the like might help orient students to what they will find when they enter the institution. Such activities also underscore the expectation that students will transfer to the university and attain a 4-year degree. Conversely, university personnel—in keeping with the suggestion made above—need to go out to the reservation and learn more about tribal life if they are to be better acquainted with the lives of their students. The argument here is that, rather than students simply visiting an institution to learn about an alien culture, such activity ought to be developed within a cultural context that highlights how both groups are going to learn about, and with, one another.

3. Organizational Coordination And Effectiveness

Too many task forces and study groups have been created to investigate the "problems" of Indian students where no resulting action has been forthcoming. In effect, the creation of the task force, and the recommendations it makes, have been the action. Clearly, the purpose of a task force should not be to obfuscate issues or paper over differences until time passes, but unfortunately that has been the case in a number of instances.

The point is not to be cynical about task forces or commissions; rather, strategic plans need to be developed that have longer time horizons than a year or two. Cultural pluralism is an enduring issue in the United States. The nature of Native American involvement in academe must remain a top priority if the fundamental relationships are to be changed. To reduce attrition and increase recruitment of American Indians to academe will require a long-standing commitment and involvement on the part of each institution. Overall organizational strategies need to be developed and implemented.

Far too often one part of an institution develops a program in isolation from the rest of the university or college, so that any sense of coordination is absent. Someone has a good idea and finds funds to implement the idea. Yet criteria for whether specific goals have been reached are absent. The funding runs out, and the program dies. The cycle begins again when someone gets another good idea and locates a funding source. Universities and tribal colleges need to come to terms with which programs help Indian students and which programs do not, and, when programs are proven successful, the institution needs to incorporate them into its budget so that the project administrators have the leeway to plan over a longer period of time instead of constantly searching for funds. Such a suggestion is crucial for tribal colleges that must tie specific evaluation criteria to funding requests from a tight-fisted federal government, and to public universities in states that face financial disaster. In an era of fiscal shortfalls administrators need to have specific criteria on which to base financial decisions; all too often programs for American Indians have no evaluation criteria whatsoever tied to them.

Native American recruitment and retention is a generational issue, and institutions such as Patchwork University need to think about it in this manner. The question needs to be asked how well equipped the specific institution is to deal, not only with Indian students today, but also with American Indian students who are now in the first grade. The suggestion here is that institutions reorient the manner in which they approach American Indian involvement in academe, and the manner in which they approach Native American participation ought to take into account manifold voices.

4. Organizational Voice

Far too often university administrators and state officials have developed strategies for dealing with Indian lives without discussing these strategies with those individuals most involved—Indian students and their families. Part of the problem pertains to organizational discourse; often those who have not participated in academic organizations have not learned the academic argot necessary to discuss issues with administrators. Yet like the first point in this section, if an organization's participants are actively concerned with enacting a critical perspective, what is necessary will be quite different from most current organizational efforts. Instead of administrators trying to symbolically include Indian voice on a committee by adding one Native American, the committee needs to reconsider how it might constitute itself so that Indian people are fully represented and participate.

Organizational jargon may need to be dropped, and discussions will revolve around an Indian framework instead of an agenda drawn up and led by Anglos. Indeed, the nature of this book has been one step in that direction. To come to terms with the problems that Indian students face, Indian students had to be heard. Local administrators must take similar steps even further. One flaw of this book is that students' families have not been given enough voice; they have not been heard. In a localized context such as a university, tribal people need to be brought in, and the university will go out to them, in order to gain the wisdom and ideas that families have about what to do for their children's education.

Again, universities have much to learn from tribal colleges such as College of the Plains. In-service activities and constant interaction between a university and tribal college allows for the possibility of both groups learning from one another. As with any small institution, tribal college personnel are often called upon to assume multiple tasks. Universities often have no one who is assigned a specific task to deal with tribal colleges. Perhaps an individual assigned to the state coordinating board might be able to shepherd long-standing arrangements between both institutions, with the expectation that native voices will be heard rather than ignored.

5. Organizational Culture

If the participants in an organization understand cultures different from their own, then organizational activities will more centrally reflect a diverse environment. At present, however, most organizational activities on mainstream campuses are monocultural and offer potent symbols to Indian students that they are not welcome. Far too often cultural sensitivity has been equated with a once-a-year powwow that occurs on campus, or an Indian taco sale in the cafeteria to raise funds for a particular activity. Again, the point is not to denigrate such activities or suggest that they should be stopped, but instead to incorporate a wider range of cultural activities.

An organizational culture that truly celebrates diverse groups will have myriad activities, symbols, and events that speak to diversity. Indian ways of life and values will be celebrated and affirmed so that native languages are given as much accord as other languages. Of consequence, the institution will see that native language is not a weakness of the student but a strength. All students will be encouraged to be bilingual; in this light those students who may need the most help are often Anglos who only speak English. "Married" student housing will be changed to reflect "family" student housing, insofar as many Indian people come from extended families. When American Indians come to college, they do not leave their families behind, and again, rejecting "rituals of integration," the point will be to encourage and support the families of Indian students. Similarly, as with College of the Plains, families will be seen to be integral to the counseling and advising process.

To reiterate, being aware of cultural differences and addressing cultural needs does not mean that expectations are lowered or that the standards of the institutions are lessened. A competent and dedicated faculty, administration, and staff who have knowledge and awareness of cultural differences enhance the college environment. A college that reflects a culture of diversity is an institution for the 21st century. When cultures interact, there is bound to be conflict and disagreement. Still, an institution that struggles to highlight diversity is one where such conflict and disagreement can expose false interpretations and bring to light mutual understandings that have previously been hidden or avoided.

To reorient an organization in the manner suggested here is obviously not an easy task. Rather than try to change a student, the suggestion has been to change the organization. Yet simply because a task is difficult does not mean it is impossible. Indeed, the costs related to reorienting the institution are not insurmountable. The first step begins with the assumptions of this book; if Native American culture is to be celebrated and not denied in academe, what must occur? Five generalized organizational responses have been offered. What remains to be outlined are specific pedagogic issues that will enhance rituals of empowerment.

CULTURE, PEDAGOGY, AND LEARNING

What follows naturally relates to the previous section. To encourage organizational leaders to learn about the culture of American Indians obviously impacts on the way a teacher functions in the classroom. In this section, four additional overarching points are discussed that have implications for the manner in which individuals conceptualize pedagogy, learning, and curriculum. In essence, each of these points highlights how the curriculum needs to be situated in the immediate context of the students and in the larger context of society.

1. Authority In The Classroom

Within the confines of the structure and system of an organization's culture the instructor has legitimated authority to create the climate in the classroom. A critical perspective encourages the faculty member to lessen his or her classroom authority and function more as a facilitator or guide than someone who is an expert. Large lecture classes where an Indian student sits passively taking notes will be rejected in favor of classrooms where everyone is encouraged to be involved in determining the nature of the classroom's relations.

Oftentimes individuals will argue that small classes may well be appropriate for humanities courses, where dialogue is essential, but that this is not the case for instruction in accounting or mathematics, for example. Such an argument confuses pedagogy with teaching, where teaching is viewed as the transmission of static knowledge from the knower to the learner. Pedagogy, on the other hand, suggests that learning is more than the transmission of knowledge. The manner in which knowledge is constructed and conveyed in an accounting class is as necessary to be culturally appropriate as it is in an English or history class. And a classroom is not an isolated event. The actions in one classroom relate to occurrences in other classrooms; the out-of-class experiences that students participate in help create a particular orientation toward learning by the organization's participants.

The point here is that, for the lives of American Indian students to be affirmed in the classroom, teachers need to construct the relations of the class in culturally specific ways that encourage and engage students. A teacher will never know how a student such as Fanny James, who sits in the back row of a 300-student lecture, perceives the class other than through examinations that test content. The argument from a critical viewpoint is that such testing is not enough of an analysis of what students should learn.

A central component of critical pedagogy is to encourage students to engage their own pasts and histories to understand how their lives have been shaped and formed by the larger forces at work in society. A classroom based on critical pedagogy of necessity must create the relations in the classroom that are desired for the student. To exhort students to examine their lives and to challenge authority, but to do so in a lecture format where students will be tested for the knowledge conveyed, is contradictory. Collaborative learning and other similar pedagogies cannot successfully take place if the teacher is not a collaborative learner and the environment is not one conducive to cooperation instead of competition.

Herein lies a key principle. The faculty member is not only someone who has specific forms of knowledge; the faculty member is also a learner. Students will have specific forms of knowledge themselves that the teacher utilizes and affirms. Whenever possible, distances between teacher and student will be collapsed and the power of the student will be enhanced. Such a suggestion is as important in a science class as it is in an English composition course.

Such a point often creates counterarguments. Some will argue that highlighting and enabling students to utilize their power in the classroom overlooks that specific material needs to be covered; consequently, standards will be lowered and students will not be prepared for subsequent learning or the world of work. Another argument will be that collapsing the authority between student and teacher in actuality is impossible, and that to do so allows the teacher to manipulate the situation by obscuring the relations of power.

Both arguments need to be acknowledged for their assumptions, but they also must be rejected. As stated consistently throughout this book, to call for a classroom where student voice is affirmed and celebrated—especially with regard to minority students—is not to suggest lower standards. Teachers ought to maintain high standards and expect excellence, yet these benchmarks take into account critical thinking skills that are culturally relevant. Further, the relationship between teacher and student is one based on power, and it will never completely evaporate. To encourage that power-based interactions be lessened, however, is to affirm the worth of students and reorient the relations in the classroom toward critical engagement and away from commands of authority.

2. Critical Evaluation

As noted, high expectations and high standards are essential. Twentieth century schooling, however, has placed far too great an emphasis on grading and tests as indicators of how much a student has learned. Such grading has done little to advance the learning of American Indian students; if anything, grading and testing has operated to discourage and exclude Native Americans.

From a critical perspective, constant interaction and feedback needs to occur between teacher and student about the nature of their progress in the classroom. Again, such interaction necessitates small classes where opportunities for such feedback will arise. Interactions in this manner also must occur in culturally specific ways. Formal meetings between teacher and student, for example, may not be the best forum for enabling Indian students to grasp hold of difficult material. Indian students tend to work better in groups; consequently, perhaps reviews of one's work should occur in a group. And if institutions exist where grades are mandated, then some vehicle must be considered where a student is not permanently held behind because of bad grades. For example, perhaps at some point during a student's career a purge of the individual's transcript might be made, if necessary, so that a low grade point average does not deny the student financial aid or tell the individual that he or she is incapable of learning.

Again, the emphasis is not on lowering standards but on reorienting them. To assume that the content of what a student learns during the course of the semester can be reduced to a letter or numerical grade is reductive in nature and needs to be reformulated. The intent is to move away from grading and evaluating students in order to sort them and place them in relation to others, and to move toward evaluation methods that will be inherently helpful to the student.

3. Culture, Time, And Space

The faculty member who has learned and continues to learn about the culture of Native Americans will realize that the way the classroom is structured influences how people learn. Whenever possible teachers need to acknowledge the culture of Indian students and incorporate such learning into the content and structure of the class. Again, such possibilities will arise, not only in an English class that reads a Native American author, but also in classes such as science or engineering, where culturally specific temporal and spatial characteristics are devised for the classroom. Cooperative group activities, for example, are more in keeping with American Indian culture than are individualized projects that emphasize competition.

A host of cues, verbal and nonverbal, operate as signals that instructors need to be attuned to if they are to be able to interpret their students as individuals with specific cultural backgrounds. The challenge for the instructor is to develop a repertoire of teaching strategies and skills that will move the classroom away from a monocultural style that reinforces mainstream, Anglo culture.

Further, linkages need to be developed between what takes place in, and what exists beyond, the classroom. The extended family from which American Indian students come offers a wealth of opportunities for the culturally sensitive teacher. Not only will individuals be brought into the classroom at different times as guest lecturers, but the teacher will be aware that students are part of an extended family, so that the classroom will extend out into the community. The "stop-out" status for all students might be institutionalized, so that, if a student chooses to return to college, he or she will not need to reapply. Such an action honors the idea that students have obligations beyond the classroom, and that a 15-week semester is a cultural construction that sometimes conflicts with familial obligations. Instead of making the student fit into the mainstream culture, the organization will adapt the classroom to a culturally specific temporal action—namely, letting students come and go with greater ease than currently exists.

The point with all of these suggestions is to encourage teachers to think about how culture operates in their classrooms and to learn about the cultures of their Indian students. Cultural sensitivity must go beyond generalized points such as that Indian students are shy, or a passing awareness of traditional arts. Instead, cultural awareness operates by way of the multiple communicative, temporal, and spatial cues at a teacher's command that enhances the self-referential nature of learning.

4. Advising

As fundamental to the act of instruction in the classroom is the manner in which faculty act as advisors to American Indian students. Advisors need to be more directly involved in the life of the student. The point is not that an advisor necessarily needs to become a friend or companion to the student, but that the student's life beyond the classroom is valued and honored. Consider the students discussed in Chapter 4. Most of the students at the mainstream universities found their lives difficult and at times fearful. All of the individuals would have benefitted from culturally sensitive counseling about the range of college problems—from what classes to take, to navigating the bureaucratic waters, from how to study, to dealing with roommate conflicts. Some students found such counseling in Native American studies centers, but advising needs to be founded on a basis that is more systematic than serendipitous. Structures created where individuals may come together to provide guidance and support can be beneficial.

As with the other points offered in this section, the advisor ought to be aware of the cultural milieu in which advising takes place so that the teacher reaches out to the student rather than vice versa. Such a suggestion goes to the heart of the way individuals interact with one another in organizations. For example, Anglo faculty often communicate within timed sequences of 30 minutes or 1 hour; it is not unusual to hear of an advisor who schedules a meeting with a student for 30 minutes on a Thursday at 11:00. Although the cultural norm allows for the teacher to be late, it would be deemed incorrect if the student were late or simply skipped the appointment. Such is not always the case with Native American students, whose cultural construction of time may be entirely different.

The suggestion is straightforward: to effectively meet the needs of Indian students, an organization's participants need to come to grips with how the cultures of individuals frame their understandings of the world. Sometimes, these understandings will be at odds with the way the teacher or advisor constructs time, space, and communication. Instead of forcing the student to adapt to the teacher, the advice here is the opposite: encourage the teacher to learn the ways of the students.

CONCLUSION

A comment needs to be offered about how these suggestions might be utilized. Some of these points mirror or extend recommendations made by integrationists such as Delpit or Tinto. Other comments, if they are abstracted from the overall framework in which they reside or are misinterpreted, may be little more than a throwback to older decision-making models utilized by academic administrators. For example, the suggestion that teachers learn about the culture of their students has been advocated by Delpit. To call for organizational coordination on a specific issue such as minority affairs could lead to an overly bureaucratized system.

The thesis in this chapter, however, and indeed throughout the book, has been to encourage all participants in colleges and universities to think about a comprehensive response to minority participation in academe that calls upon a critical perspective. Organizational coordination, for example, is one step in that direction, but it is insufficient if American Indian voices are not centrally included in what is to be done. Learning about the culture of their students is another step toward enacting a critical pedagogy, but it is inadequate if the purpose of learning about tribal cultures is merely to enable the teacher to acquaint students with how to learn knowledge from a static, decontextualized perspective.

Some will argue that the suggestions here are too all-encompassing and demand too much effort on the part of postsecondary institutions. The response is twofold. First, many of these changes are attitudinal. An institution does not need to spend vast resources to encourage pedagogy or to celebrate American Indian cultures. Second, however, resources will need to be redirected as an institution alters its priorities and affirms that it will no longer stand for patterns of alienation and discouragement that are currently found within its borders.

The realization that dramatic new goals need to be met should not be left in the hands of nay-sayers or minimalists who want to maintain the status quo or obfuscate the very real problems that exist. Academe must do more than officially encourage students to attend college on mainstream society's terms, for when this is done Indian students generally encounter institutional discouragement. Instead, participants in academic organizations need to develop rituals of empowerment that enable American Indian students to celebrate their culture and become critically engaged in the life of the institution, their tribes, their families, and themselves. To do so offers American society vast potential for the 21st century and fulfills an obligation to Native Americans that has yet to be met.

Appendix A

Method and Praxis

In this section I offer a brief comment on the methodology employed for this study. In my previous work I have discussed the method of transcription and analysis utilized for qualitative research (Tierney, 1988), the manner in which one presents data (Chaffee & Tierney, 1988), and the procedures one uses to reduce bias and insure trustworthiness (Tierney, 1989b). In general I employed the same procedures in this study that I have called upon in other work. However, this study differed in a variety of ways from my previous research efforts.

Although I have conducted multiple case studies in other projects, and all of my work has been longitudinal insofar as it has extended at least over one academic year, in no other book has my focus of attention been on a group of people who are culturally different from me. That is, I am an Anglo researcher who has studied Native American students. Previous research populations have included ethnic minorities as interviewees, yet I have never had as my focus a specific group such as American Indian students. Of consequence, I want to elaborate on the role an author such as myself might utilize to understand the reality of people culturally different from him or her self. I also want to be self-critical and point out this study's shortcomings. I then comment on how a critical approach compels the researcher to blend theory and action in a manner consistent with the idea of praxis.

Narrative Structures

Presently, the dilemma of constructing narratives is of central concern to qualitative researchers, especially for those who avail themselves of interpretive or critical approaches (Brodkey, 1987; Rabinow, 1985;

Paredes & Bauman, 1972; Foucault, 1977). As Anderson (1989, p. 254) notes, "Perhaps the most pressing issue facing critical ethnographers today with respect to the validity or trustworthiness of their accounts is the exploration of reflexivity, that is, self-reflective processes that keep their critical framework from becoming the container into which the data are poured." Essentially, the problem pertains to the interpretive categories researchers apply to their data. As discussed in Part One, a critical approach focuses on the relationship between theory and data, the effect of the researcher's presence on the data collected, and a consideration of the structural and historical forces that informed the study. A methodological discussion extends that concern by analyzing the biases a researcher has and how the individual has incorporated systematic self-reflexivity into the research activity.

Again, as Anderson (1989, p. 255) comments, "Little progress has been made in exploring methods that promote the kind of reflexivity required of the critical ethnographer." Although there are few guideposts to self-reflexive analysis, I offer three comments on tools I used for this research as an initial way to begin a discussion about how our narratives might be more self-reflexive.

Author/subject. I once spent 2 years as a Peace Corps volunteer in Morocco. I lived in a village where I was the only "foreigner" and the only individual who spoke English. I was confronted with what it is like to be different, and how cultures are different from one another. Additionally, over a dozen years ago I lived and worked as an academic dean at a tribally controlled college on the Fort Berthold reservation. During my tenure there I became intimately connected to the problems and struggles that American Indian students face. I also gained insight into the daily lives of Native American people. Subsequently, I have remained interested and involved in the tribal college movement.

Far too often, Anglo researchers study ethnic minorities and they have had little or no previous experience in dealing with the lives of minority students. Conversely, individuals such as well-meaning administrators sometimes become so immersed in the lives of a particular constituency that they lose any sense of distance or perspective of those whom they study. By no means do I want to imply that, simply because someone has lived and worked in another culture or with a particular population, he or she will have achieved an adequate sense of self-reflexivity. However, I am certain that to have no cultural sensitivity or awareness of those who we study will lead to misunderstanding and false interpretations. I am also suggesting that one needs a particular distance from people in order to gain perspective.

The president of College of the Plains commented that, when she hired Anglo teachers, "I look for people who have been in the Peace Corps or Vista. Who have some sense of what another culture is like. They're not perfect, but they have some initial sense of what it takes to survive here and to teach. They realize they have a lot of learning to do; others often don't know that." The president's comment reiterates my own suggestion. At a minimum, to undertake a study of ethnic minorities the researcher ought to have an in-depth understanding of those to be studied.

Author/data. I have undertaken two activities which have helped shape the data. First, prior to the project's undertaking I held a meeting with tribal college presidents to get their advice and suggestions about how best to proceed. I outlined the purpose of the study, what I intended to do, and how I proposed to study American Indian recruitment and retention in academe. Their initial advice was invaluable in helping me think through what I wanted to do and how I might best come to terms with understanding Native American students.

Second, I also formed an Advisory Board composed of Elgin Badwound, Clara Sue Kidwell, Bobby Wright, and Daniel McLaughlin; all but McLaughlin are Native Americans, and McLaughlin has lived and worked on the Navajo reservation for the past 15 years. Each of the individuals is intimately knowledgeable about tribal colleges and the struggles and challenges that Indian students face on mainstream campuses. Each person provided me with particular help on different problems.

Badwound, president of Ogalala Lakota College, forced me to think through the categories I initially developed about Native American students on mainstream campuses. He also collected data at some sites that did not appear in this work and contributed substantially to the portrait of Home College. Kidwell, professor of Native American Studies at the University of California, Berkeley, aided in my understanding of the theoretical discussion about culture, rituals, and critical theory. In particular, she offered an initial understanding about how Indian students view education in a manner fundamentally different from the way Anglos conceive it; that is, education is not viewed as a stepping stone to a better life, but as a way to rip the young away from their home environment. Wright and McLaughlin were my most serious editors and critics. Bobby Wright, once director of Native American Studies at Montana State University and now an assistant professor at Penn State University, challenged me to write less abstractly and to address more concretely how critical theory may be utilized by individuals concerned with Indian education. Dan McLaughlin, once principal of Rock Point School and now assistant professor at the University of Utah, helped me think through the methodological ramifications of the study, and how best to present the data.

As with the points made in the previous section, a meeting with tribal college presidents and the selection of an Advisory Board will not ensure self-reflexivity. But again, the converse is also true. If researchers do not call upon the advice of those native peoples intimately connected with the research under study, they will inevitably fall short of a self-reflexive goal. Indeed, one suggestion that has previously been made I did not utilize here, and the study would have been better if I had.

None of the students read this book. Although the liaisons for the sites have been sent drafts of the work, and they were free to provide copies to whomever desired, the practicalities of conducting longitudinal research, and the shortcomings with regard to resources, obviated my ability to engage interviewees more fully. For example, I finished a draft of this book more than a year after I had visited most of the sites. All of these sites are thousands of miles from my home. The point is that, in a perfect world, I would have been more fully engaged with the interviewees than I was; but we do not live in a perfect world. Thus, one shortcoming of this research and a point that I will return to in the final section is how to enact praxis-oriented research. Nevertheless, at a minimum, researchers need to incorporate the advice and suggestions of those under study at least in a manner in keeping with the suggestions made here.

Author/narrative. This appendix is the first section where I have called upon the first-person singular. Anyone familiar with my work will know I have written virtually all of my previous research from the perspective of the first person. I consciously chose not to use the first person in this text for a variety of reasons. On one level, I believe authors should continually experiment with the manner in which they present data in order not to rigidify and to be able to ramify their theoretical constructs. To the extent that writing influences how readers experience a research topic, the author ought to be sensitive to structuring reality in such a manner, as if reality were unchanging from one research topic to another.

Further, and more importantly, I wanted the reader to become involved with the multitude of American Indian voices in the text as quickly as possible and without any overt intrusiveness on the part of the author. I did not, for example, provide a preface or acknowledgements section, in the hope that the sooner the reader arrived to the text and the voices of Indian students, the more clearly the reader might hear of the struggles and challenges they face.

177

I also sought to bring to life the manifold perspectives that exist so that the reader did not hear native voices as if all students spoke in unison. As Quantz and O'Connor (1988, p. 106) have pointed out, "We must listen closely to the multiple voices with which the [disempowered] speak. . . . We should expect to hear the conflicts which have been set up within them." Accordingly, we heard from students who liked school and those who did not; we listened to students who utilized the Native American Studies Center and others who avoided it; we learned that some students found tribal colleges useful and others who thought they were not.

The aim of the text, then, was to enable the reader to hear the voices of Indian students and to lessen the author's explicit role within the narrative. Obviously, I have constructed the conceptual categories and developed the structure of the text, but the avoidance of the first person singular has made for a less intrusive narrative than if I had done otherwise. Yet again, the point is not that all texts should avoid a particular narrative device or that the use of one narrative insures textual self-reflexivity; however, within the confines of this project, the narrative I chose to employ seemed to work best.

In Part Two I noted how the lack of analysis with regard to gender and class relations were shortcomings; I also have mentioned how the students' families could have been more fully incorporated into the text. An additional study might also pertain to how American Indian high school students perceive college life. Each of these topics—gender, class, familial relations, and adolescence—are worthy topics of study and analysis. If this text emphasized the cultural relations of college going, other texts ought to incorporate additional categories such as gender. The point here is not that the text fails because I have not explicitly utilized gender, for example, as a category of analysis, but that a portrait of reality is never complete, never finished. A text presents a slice of the world, and authors and readers need to come to terms with what other "slices" of the world need to be incorporated in order to have a better view. I argue, then, for further study and analysis of college life that utilizes categories such as gender and class.

Theory and Action

Savage (1988, p. 8; emphasis in original) defines *praxis* as a "kind of *thinking* and the kind of *action* that is characteristic of a free person in the polis or civic community.... Praxis is work that includes research, practical and ethical judgments, reflection and contemplation." From a critical perspective, praxis-oriented research struggles to engage people in self-organization. The portrait of the disengaged intellectual who has formed no relationship with the "real" world is a contradiction for a praxis-oriented researcher. As Lather (1986b) points out:

> We who do empirical research in the name of emancipatory politics must discover ways to connect our research methodology to our theoretical concerns and commitments. At its simplest, this is a call for critical inquirers to practice in their empirical endeavors what they preach in their theoretical formulations. (p. 258)

I have undertaken a variety of activities that I hope enact the theoretical argument outlined in this book. Although these activities warrant a greater discussion than will be provided here, I mention three actions that have naturally followed from the theoretical orientation discussed in this book. First, I have tried to engage my own students in a critical pedagogy that encourages them to be self-referential and active. I try in my classroom to promote dialogue rather than authoritative lectures. Second, I am currently engaged on my campus on a variety of issues that seek to give voice to those who are silent and disempowered, and to encourage faculty to consider alternative avenues of teaching and learning. Third, and specifically with regard to this text, I have been concerned for quite some time about the benefits that accrue to an author that go unmentioned and unrecognized. Some authors will gain promotion and tenure from the publication of a book; I have often wondered what the people under study gain. In one small way, I have an answer for my own work here. To the extent that any copies are sold, half the royalties for this book will go to a tribal college such as College of the Plains.

The lives of researchers and faculty are compartmentalized, so that we are often encouraged not to engage in praxis-oriented research. Indeed, the academic reward structure provides disincentives for such activity, and we also have few role models to discover what such activity might entail. I know in my own life I fail on a variety of fronts all too often. I strive for dialogue in a classroom, for example, and end up silencing someone. I reach for consensus in a university study group on critical theory, and I encounter resistance. Or most pertinently for this book, I try to hear a student's words but find that my own discourse has gotten in the way. Yet we do not live in a perfect world, and our attempts should not be discouraged or stopped when our actions do not turn out as we had planned. At the same time, we must not be content with our shortcomings or failures, for in a world such as ours beset with oppression and injustice, we must constantly strive to engage, to act, to change those structures and systems that disable and disempower.

References

Acker, J., Barry, K., & Esseveld, J. (1983). Objectivity and truth: Problems in doing feminist research. *Women's Studies Int. Forum*, *6*(4), 423–435.

Alba, R. D., & Lavin, D. E. (1981). Community colleges and tracking in higher education. *Sociology of Education*, *54*, 223–237.

Allaire, Y., & Firsirotu, M. E. (1984). Theories of organizational culture. *Organizational Studies*, *5*(3), 193–226.

Allen, W. (1985). Black student, white campus: Structured, interpersonal, and psychological correlates of success. *Journal of Negro Education*, *54*, 134–147.

Apple, M. W., & Jungck, S. (1990). "You don't have to be a teacher to teach this unit": Teaching, technology, and gender in the classroom. *American Educational Research Journal*, *27*(2), 227–251.

Anderson, G. L. (1989). Critical ethnography in education: Origins, current status, and new decisions. *Review of Educational Research*, *59*(3), 249–270.

Association of American Colleges. (1985). *Integrity in the college curriculum: A report to the academic community*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges.

Astin, A. (1975, July). *The myth of equal access in public higher education.* Paper presented at Southern Education Foundation, Atlanta.

Astin, A. (1977). *Four critical years: Effects of college on beliefs, attitudes, and knowledge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A. (1982). *Minorities in American higher education: Recent trends, current prospects, and recommendations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Badwound, E. (1989). *Personal correspondence with William G. Tierney.* University Park, PA: CSHE/PSU.

Badwound, E. (1990). *Leadership and American Indian values: The tribal college dilemma*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.

Bean, J. P., & Metzner, B. S. (1985, March). *A conceptual model of nontraditional student attrition*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Chicago.

Benally, H. (1988). Dine philosophy of learning. *Journal of Navajo Education*, *VI*(1), 10–13.

180

Bender, L. W. (Ed.). (1990). *Spotlight on the transfer function: A national study of state policies and practices*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Birdsell, D. (1984). *Minorities in higher education*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Boyer, E. (1987). *College: The undergraduate experience in America*. New York: Harper & Row.

Brint, S., & Karabel, J. (1989a). The community college and democratic ideals. *Community College Review*, *1*(2), 9–19.

Brint, S., & Karabel, J. (1989b). *The diverted dream: Community colleges and the promise of educational opportunity in America, 1900–1985*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brodkey, L. (1987). Writing ethnographic narratives. *Written Communication*, *4*(1), 25–50.

Bureau of the Census. (1985). *A statistical profile of the American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut populations for the United States, 1980*. Suitland, MD: Bureau of the Census.

Cabrera, A. F., Stampen, J. O., & Hansen, W. L. (1990). Explaining the effects of ability to pay on persistence in college. *The Review of Higher Education*, *13*(3), 303–336.

Chaffee, E. E., & Tierney, W. G. (1988). *Collegiate culture and leadership strategies*. New York: American Council on Education and Macmillan Publishing.

Codd, J. (1989). Educational leadership as reflective action. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 157–178). London: The Falmer Press.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1989). *The American community college* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Delpit, L. D. (1986). Skills and other dilemmas of a progressive Black educator. *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(4), 379–385.

Delpit, L. D. (1988). The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children. *Harvard Educational Review*, *58*(3), 280–298.

Deskins, D. (1983). *Minority recruitment data*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allenheld.

Dolman, G., & Kaufman, N. S. (1984). *Minorities in higher education: The changing southwest (Arizona)*. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Dolman, G., & Kaufman, N. S. (1985). *Minorities in higher education: The changing southwest (New Mexico)*. Boulder, CO: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education.

Donovan, R., Schaier-Peleg, B., & Forer, B. (Eds.). (1987). *Transfer: Making it work*. Washington, DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

Donovan, R., & Schaier-Peleg, B. (1988, January–February). Making transfer work. *Change*, pp. 33–37.

Dougherty, K. (1986, April). *The effects of community colleges: Aid or hindrance to socioeconomic attainment?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

DuBois, W. E. B. (1903). *The souls of Black folk*. Chicago: A. C. McClurg.

Edwards, E. D., Edwards, M. E., Daines, G. M., & Reed, S. M. (1984). Modeling: An important ingredient in higher education for American Indian women students. *Journal of National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors*, *48*(1), 31–35.

Edgewater, I. L. (1981). Stress and the Navajo university students. *Indian Education*, *20*(3), 25–31.

Erdoes, R., & Ortiz, A. (Eds.). (1984). *American Indian myths and legends*. New York: Pantheon.

Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press.

Fay, B. (1975). *Social theory and political practice*. London: Allen and Unwin.

Fay, B. (1987). *Critical social science*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Feldman, K. A., & Newcomb, T. M. (1973). *The impact of college on students* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Foner, P. (Ed.). (1970). *W. E. B. DuBois speaks*. New York: Pathfinder Press.

Foster, W. (1991). A model of agency for postgraduate education. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Culture and ideology in higher education: Advancing a critical agenda* (pp. 107–126). New York: Praeger.

Foucault, M. (1977). What is an author? In *Language, counter-memory, practice: Selected interviews by Michel Foucault*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1971–1977*. New York: Pantheon.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: The Seabury Press.

French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150–167). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

French, L. (1987). *Psychocultural change and the American Indian*. New York: Garland Publishers.

Fries, J. E. (1987). *The American Indian in higher education, 1975–76 to 1984–85*. Washington, DC: Center for Education Statistics.

Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures: Selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.

Geertz, C. (1983). *Local knowledge*. New York: Basic Books.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Giroux, H. (1981). Pedagogy, permission and the politics of conformity: A reply to Linda McNeil. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *11*(3), 211–222.

Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and resistance in education: A pedagogy for the opposition*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. (1986). Authority, intellectuals, and the politics of practical learning. *Teachers College Record*, *88*(1), 22–40.

Giroux, H. (1988a). Border pedagogy in the age of postmodernism. *Journal of Education*, *170*(3), 162–181.

Giroux, H. (1988b). *Teachers as intellectuals: Toward a critical pedagogy of learning*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Giroux, H. (1990). The politics of postmodernism. *Journal of Urban and Cultural Studies*, *1*(1), 5–38.

Gleazer, E. J., Jr. (1968). *This is the community college*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Green, M. F. (1989). *Minorities on campus: A handbook for enhancing diversity*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Greenfield, T. B. (1973). Organizations as social inventions: Rethinking assumptions about change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *9*(5), 551–574.

Grubb, W. N. (1984). The bandwagon once more: Vocational preparation for high-tech occupations. *Harvard Educational Review*, *54*(4), 429–451.

Grubb, W. N. (1989). The effects of differentiation on educational attainment: The case of community colleges. *The Review of Higher Education*, *12*(4), 349–374.

Grubb, W. N., & Lazerson, M. (1975). Rally round the workplace: Continuities and fallacies in career education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *45*, 452–474.

Hartsock, N. (1983). *Money, sex, and power: Toward a feminist historical materialism*. New York: Longman.

Hartsock, N. (1987). Rethinking modernism: Minority vs. majority theories. *Cultural Critique*, *7*, 187–206.

Havel, V. (1990). *Living in truth*. London: Faber and Faber.

Hodgkinson, H. L., Hamilton-Outtz, & Obarakpor, A. M. (1990). *The demographics of American Indians: One percent of the people; fifty percent of the diversity* (31 pp.). Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, Inc.

Huffman, T. E., Sill, M. L., & Brokenleg, M. (1986). College achievement among Sioux and white South Dakota students. *Journal of American Indian Education*, *25*(2), 32–38.

Jones, R. M. (1981). *Experiment at Evergreen*. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman Books.

Karabel, J. (1986). Community colleges and social stratification in the 1980's. In L. Zwerling (Ed.), *The community college and its critics* (New Directions for Community Colleges, 54, pp. 13–30). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lather, P. (1986a). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. *Interchange*, *17*(4), 63–84.

Lather, P. (1986b). Research as praxis. *Harvard Educational Review*, *56*(3), 257–277.

Leach, E. (1968). *International encyclopedia of the social sciences* (Vols. 13–14). New York: Macmillan.

Lemert, C. C., & Gillan, G. (1982). *Michel Foucault: Social theory and transgression*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lipka, J. M. (1989). A cautionary tale of curriculum development in Yup'ik Eskimo communities. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *20*, 216–231.

Loo, C. M., & Rolison, G. (1986). Alienation of ethnic minority students at a predominantly white university. *Journal of Higher Education*, *57*, 58–77.

MacLeod, J. (1987). *Ain't no makin' it*. Boulder, CO: Western Press.

McDermott, R. P. (1987). The explanation of minority school failure, again. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *18*(4), 361–364.

McDermott, R. P. (1989). Discussant comments: Making dropouts. In H. T. Trueba, G. Spindler, & L. Spindler (Eds.), *What do anthropologists have to say about dropouts?* (pp. 16–26). New York: The Falmer Press.

McLaren, P. (1985). The ritual dimensions of resistance: Clowning and symbolic inversion. *Journal of Education*, *167*(2), 84–97.

McLaren, P. (1986). *Schooling as a ritual performance*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

McLaren, P. (1988). Schooling the postmodern body: Critical pedagogy and the politics of enfleshment. *Journal of Education*, *170*(3), 53–83.

McLaren, P. (1989). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy in the foundations of education*. New York: Longman.

McLaughlin, D. (1991). *When literacy empowers: An ethnography of uses for English and Navajo print*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

McLaughlin, D. (in press). Power and the politics of knowledge: Transformative leadership and curriculum development for minority language learners. *Peabody Journal of Education*.

McNeley, D. (1988). A Navajo curriculum in the national context. *Journal of Navajo Life*, pp. 125–136.

Medsker, L. L., & Tillery, D. (1971). *Breaking the access barriers: A profile of two-year colleges*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Mingle, J. (1987). *Focus on minorities: Trends in higher education participation and success*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Moll, L. C., & Diaz, S. (1987). Change as the goal of educational research. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *18*(4), 300–311.

Mortimer, K. P. (1984). *Involvement in learning*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Mouffe, C. (1990). Radical democracy or liberal democracy? *Socialist Review*, *2*, 57–66.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1985). *The condition of education 1985: A statistical report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1986–1987). Unpublished data. Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1987, July). *Financial statistics of institutions of higher education*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Navajo Nation. (1988). *FAX 88*. Window Rock, AZ: Commission for Accelerating Navajo Development Opportunities.

Newman, F. (1985). *Higher education and the American resurgence*. Princeton, NJ: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Nora, A. (1987). Determinants of retention among Chicano college students: A structural model. *Research in Higher Education*, *26*(1), 31–59.

Nora, A., Attinasi, L. C., Jr., & Matonak, A. (1990). Testing qualitative indicators of precollege factors in Tinto's attrition model: A community college student population. *The Review of Higher Education*, *13*(3), 337–355.

Nora, A., & Rendon, L. (1988). Hispanic student retention in community colleges: Reconciling access with outcomes. In L. Weis (Ed.), *Class, race, and gender in American Education* (pp. 126–143). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Ogbu, J. U. (1989). The individual in collective adaptation: A framework for focusing on academic underperformance and dropping out among involuntary minorities. In L. Weis, E. Farrar, & H. G. Petrie (Eds.), *Dropouts from school* (pp. 181–204). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Olivas, M. A. (1979). *The dilemma of access: Minorities in two year colleges*. Washington, DC: Howard University Press.

Olivas, M. A. (1982). Indian, Chicano, and Puerto Rican colleges: Status and issues. *Bilingual Review*, *9*(1), 36–58.

Olivas, M. A. (1983). The Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act of 1978: The failure of Federal Indian Higher Education Policy. *American Indian Law Review*, *9*(2), 219–251.

Olneck, M. R. (1990). The recurring dream: Symbolism and ideology in intercultural and multicultural education. *American Journal of Education*, *98*(2), 147–174.

Oppelt, N. T. (1984). The tribally controlled colleges in the 1980s: Higher education's best kept secret. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal*, *8*(4), 27–45.

Padilla, R. V., & Pavel, M. (1989, March). *The role of student advising in academic integration*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Paredes, A., & Bauman, R. (Eds.). (1972). *Toward new perspectives in folklore*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.

Peterson, M. W. (1985). Emerging developments in postsecondary organization theory and research: Fragmentation or integration. *Educational Researcher*, *14*(3), 5–12.

Pincus, F. L. (1980). The false promise of community colleges: Class conflict and vocational education. *Harvard Educational Review*, *50*(3), 332–361.

Pincus, F. L., & Archer, E. (1989). *Bridges to opportunity: Are community colleges meeting the transfer needs of minority students?* New York: Academy for Educational Development and College Entrance Examination Board.

Pottinger, R. (1988). *Outcomes of American Indian students: Northern Arizona University*. Unpublished manuscript.

Pottinger, R. (1989). The quest for valued futures: Steps on a rainbow journey. *Journal of Navajo Education*, *6*(3), 2–11.

Pottinger, R. (1990). Disjunction to higher education: American Indian students in the southwest. *Journal of Navajo Education*, *7*(2), 37–45.

Quality Education For Minorities Project. (1990). *Education that works: An action plan for the education of minorities* (Report Summary). Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Quantz, R. A., & O'Connor, T. W. (1988). Writing critical ethnography: Dialogue, multivoicedness, and carnival in cultural texts. *Educational Theory*, *38*(1), 95–109.

Rabinow, P. (1985). Discourse and power: On the limits of ethnographic texts. *Dialectical Anthropology*, *10*(122), 1–13.

Rappaport, J. (1986). Collaborating for empowerment: Creating the language of mutual help. In H. Boyte & F. Reissman (Eds.), *The new populism: The politics of empowerment* (pp. 64–79). Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Ratwik, S. H., Malmberg, M. A., & Kibble, J. (1989, March). *Increasing persistence and achievement in Native American college students: An initial step*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Rosaldo, R. (1989). *Culture and truth: The remaking of social analysis*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Rushdie, S. (1982). *Midnight's children*. New York: Avon Books.

Savage, M. C. (1988). Can ethnographic narrative be a neighborly act? *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *19*, 3–19.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, L. (1981). *Narrative, literacy, and free inter-ethnic communication*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corp.

Scott, W. J. (1986). Attachment to Indian culture and the 'difficult situation': A study of American Indian College Students. *Youth Society*, *17*(4), 381–395.

Shrewsbury, C. M. (1987). What is feminist pedagogy? *Women's Studies Quarterly*, *15*(3&4), 6–14.

Simon, R., & Dippo, D. (1986). On critical ethnographic work. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, *17*(34), 195–202.

Sleeter, C. E. (1989). Multicultural education as a form of resistance to oppression. *Journal of Education*, *171*(3), 51–71.

Spady, W. (1970). Dropouts from higher education: An interdisciplinary review and synthesis. *Interchange*, *1*, 64–85.

Spady, W. (1971). Dropouts from higher education: Toward an empirical model. *Interchange*, *2*, 38–62.

Spindler, G., & Spindler, L. (1989). There are no dropouts among the Arunta and Hutterites. In H. T. Trueba, G. Spindler, & L. Spindler (Eds.), *What do anthropologists have to say about dropouts?* (pp. 7–15). New York: The Falmer Press.

Stage, F. K. (1990). Research on college students: Commonality, difference and direction. *The Review of Higher Education*, *13*(3), 249–258.

Szasz, M. (1977). *Education and the American Indian*. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Task Force. (1987). *Program and curriculum review*. Flagstaff, AZ: Native American Indian Studies Program.

Tierney, W. G. (1988). *The web of leadership: The presidency in higher education*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Tierney, W. G. (1989a). Cultural politics and the curriculum in postsecondary education. *Journal of Education, 171*(3), 72–88.

Tierney, W. G. (1989b). *Curricular landscapes, democratic vistas: Transformative leadership in higher education*. New York: Praeger.

Tierney, W. G. (1989c). *The worlds we create: Organizational aspects of Native American participation in postsecondary education* (Research report). University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University, Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Tierney, W. G. (Ed.). (1991). *Culture and ideology in higher education: Advancing a critical agenda*. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Tijerina, K., & Biemer, P. (1988). The dance of Indian higher education: One step forward, two steps back. *Educational Record, 68*(4)/*69*(1), 86–93.

Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research, 45*(1), 89–125.

Tinto, V. (1982). Limits of theory and practice in student attrition. *Journal of Higher Education, 53*(6), 687–700.

Tinto, V. (1987). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tinto, V. (1989, September 6). Misconceptions mar campus discussions of student retention. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. B2.

Tomlinson, L. M. (1989). *Postsecondary developmental programs: A traditional agenda with new imperatives* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report #3). Washington, DC: School of Education and Human Development, The George Washington University.

Tracy, T., & Sedlacek, W. (1985). The relationship of noncognitive variables to academic success: A longitudinal comparison by race. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 26*, 405–410.

Trent, J. W., & Medsker, L. L. (1968). *Beyond high school*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Tribal Colleges: Shaping the future of Native America. (1989). Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Velez, W. (1985). Finishing college: The effects of college type. *Sociology of Education, 58*, 191–200.

Weis, L. (1985). *Between two worlds*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Willis, P. (1977). *Learning to labor: How working class kids get working class jobs*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Woodson, C. G. (1933) *The mis-education of the Negro*. New York: AMS Press, Inc.

Wright, B. (1988). "For the children of the infidels?": American Indian education in the colonial colleges. *American Indian Culture and Research Journal, 12*(3), 1–14.

Wright, B. (forthcoming). *Piety, politics, and profit: American Indian missions in the colonial colleges*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Wright, B., & Tierney, W. G. (1991, March/April). American Indians in higher education: A history of cultural conflict. *Change*.

Wright, D. (1987). Minority students: Developmental beginnings. In D. Wright (Ed.), *Responding to the needs of today's minority students* (New Directions for Student Services, No. 38, pp. 5-22). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

AUTHOR INDEX

A
Acker, J., 15, *173*
Alba, R.D., 88, *173*
Allaire, Y., 51, *173*
Allen, W., 47, *173*
Anderson, G.L., 168, *173*
Apple, M.W., 139, *173*
Archer, E., 31, *178*
Astin, A., 8, 9, 20, 90, 91, *173*
Attinasi, L.C., Jr., 24, *178*

B
Badwound, E., 51, 80, 115, 116, 128, 132, 147, *173*
Barry, K., 15, *173*
Bauman, R., 168, *178*
Bean, J.P., 24, *173*
Bennally, H., 130, 132, *173*
Bender, L.W., 152, *174*
Biemer, P., 8, *180*
Birdsell, D., 6, 8, 9, 81, *174*
Bourdieu, P., 38, *174*
Boyer, E., 144, *174*
Brawer, F.B., *174*
Brint, S., 44, 89, 112, *174*
Brodkey, L., 167, *174*
Brokenleg, M., 85, *176*

C
Cabrera, A.F., 24, *174*
Chaffee, E.E., 46, 167, *174*
Codd, J., 30, 42, *174*
Cohen, A.M., *174*

D
Daines, G.M., 85, *175*
Delpit, L.D., 138, 139, *174*
Deskins, D., 9, *174*
Diaz, S., 53, *177*
Dippo, D., 15, *179*
Dolman, G., 8, 81, *174*
Donovan, R., 31, *174*
Dougherty, K., 88, *175*
DuBois, W.E.B., 33, *175*

E
Edwards, E.D., 85, *175*
Edwards, M.E., 85, *175*
Edgewater, I.L., 85, *175*
Erdoes, R., 7, *175*
Esseveld, J., 15, *173*
Etzioni, A., 29, *175*

F
Fay, B., 26, 34, 39, 148, *175*
Feldman, K.A., 20, *175*
Firsirotu, M.E., 51, *173*
Foner, P., 33, *175*
Forer, B., 31, *174*
Foster, W., 33, 37, *175*
Foucault, M., 37–38, 168, *175*
Freire, P., 144, *175*
French, J.R.P., Jr., 29, *175*
French, L., 15, *175*
Fries, J.E., 8, 11, 82, *175*

G
Geertz, C., 12, 14, 35, *175*
Giddens, A., 37, *175*
Gillan, G., 174, *176*
Giroux, H., 34, 40–41, 42, 45, 46, 84, 145, 149, *175*, *176*
Gleazer, E.J., Jr., 44, *176*
Green, M.F., 152, *176*
Greenfield, T.B., 46, *176*
Grubb, W.N., 44, 89, *176*
Guba, E.G., 15, *176*

H
Hamilton-Outtz, 9, 11, *176*
Hansen, W.L., 24, *174*
Hartsock, N., 54, 143, *176*
Havel, V., 151, *176*
Hodgkinson, H.L., 9, 11, *176*
Huffman, T.E., 85, *176*

J
Jones, R.M., 118, *176*
Jungck, S., 139, *173*

K
Karabel, J., 44, 89, 112, *174*, *176*
Kaufman, N.S., 8, 81, *174*
Kibble, J., 85, *179*

L
Lather, P., 15, 172, *176*
Lavin, D.E., 88, *173*
Lazerson, M., 89, *176*
Leach, E., 48, *176*
Lemert, C.C., 147, *176*
Lincoln, Y.S., 15, *176*
Lipka, J.M., 146, *176*
Loo, C.M., 47, *177*

M
MacLeod, J., 13, *177*
Malmberg, M.A., 85, *179*
Matonak, A., 24, *178*
McDermott, R.P., 14, 49, *177*
McLaren, P., 34–35, 46, 51, 54, 149, *177*
McLaughlin, D., 13, 151, *177*
McNeley, D., 128, *177*
Medsker, L.L., 21, 44, *177*, *180*
Metzner, B.S., 24, *173*
Mingle, J., 6, 8, *177*
Moll, L.C., 53, *177*
Mortimer, K.P., 144, *177*
Mouffe, C., 147, *177*

N
Newcomb, T.M., 20, *175*
Newman, F., 152, *177*
Nora, A., 24, 88, *178*

O
Obarakpor, A.M., 9, 11, *176*
O'Connor, T.W., 171, *179*
Ogbu, J.U., 79, *178*
Olivas, M.A., 115, *178*
Olneck, M.R., 50, 52, *178*
Oppelt, N.T., 115, *178*
Ortiz, A., 7, *175*

P
Padilla, R.V., 85, *178*
Paredes, A., 168, *178*
Pavel, M., 85, *178*
Peterson, M.W., 27, *178*
Pincus, F.L., 31, 44, *178*
Pottinger, R., 78, *178*

Q
Quantz, R.A., 171, *179*

R
Rabinow, P., 167, *179*
Rappaport, J., 113, *179*
Ratwik, S.H., 85, *179*
Raven, B., 29, *175*
Reed, S.M., 85, *175*
Rendon, L., 88, *178*
Rolison, G., 47, *177*
Rosaldo, R., 12, 14, 48, 52, 53, 61, *179*
Rushdie, S., 137, *179*

S
Savage, M.C., 171, *179*
Schaier-Peleg, B., 31, *174*
Scollon, L., 108, *179*
Scollon, R., 108, *179*
Scott, W.J., 85, *179*
Sedlacek, W., 47, *180*
Shrewsbury, C.M., 54, 143, *179*
Sill, M.L., 85, *176*
Simon, R., 15, *179*
Sleeter, C.E., 82, *179*
Spady, W., 22, *179*

Spindler, G., 48–49, *179*
Spindler, L., 48–49, *179*
Stage, F.K., 20, 24, *179*
Stampen, J.O., 24, *174*
Szasz, M., 15, *179*

T
Tierney, W.G., 13, 18, 33, 46, 52, 118, 119, 141, 167, *174*, *179*, *180*
Tijerina, K., *180*
Tillery, D., 44, *177*
Tinto, V., 7, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 30, 31, 47, *180*
Tomlinson, L.M., 18, 19, *180*
Tracy, T., 47, *180*
Trent, J.W., 21, *180*

V
Velez, W., 88, *180*

W
Weis, L., 13, *180*
Willis, P., 13, *180*
Woodson, C.G., 33, *180*
Wright, B., 13, 18, *180*
Wright, D., 41, *180*

SUBJECT INDEX

A
Academic achievement, 21
Academic background, 20–21
Academic integration, 23–25
Advising, 163–164
Articulation, 92–93, 155–156
Attrition, 17–25, 30–31, 45–50

C
City Community College, 105–108
Class, *see* Social class
Classroom authority, 160–161
College life, 68–76
College of the Plains, 126–134
College plans, 57–59
Community, 28–29
Community colleges, 44–45, 92–93
Conceptual categories, 13
Conflict, 28–29, 37–38
Creation myths, 7
Critical theory, 1, 7, 14, 33–54, 61, 77–79, 137–150, 151–165
Critical ethnography, 13–15, 167–172
Critical perspective, *see* Critical theory
Cultural anthropology, 45
Cultural borders, 40–41
Cultural capital, 38
Cultural politics, 137–150
Culture, 14, 51–52, 162–163

D
Deconstructivism, 109–113
Demographic data, 8–9
Departure, 1, 6, 10, 17–25, 30–31, 45–50, 53
Drop-out, *see* Departure

E
Educational aspirations, 20–21
Educational resources, 90–91
Emancipation, 40
Empowerment, 14, 36, 43, 50–54, 148–150
  rituals of empowerment, 50–54, 148–150
Enrollment, 10, 87–88
Epistemological, 1, 13, 20, 26
Ethnicity, 6
Ethnography, 14
Expectations about college, 20–21
Extracurricular activity, 21

F
Family background, 20–21
Functionalism, 36
Functionalist, 45

G
Gender, 82–83
General equivalency degree, 10
Graduation rates, 8–9
Grand theory, 26, 47

H
Hidden curriculum, 40
Home College, 119–126

I
Ideology, 14, 35, 52
Integration, *see* Social integration
Interpretation, 6–7, 12–13, 27, 40

K
Knowledge, 29, 37–38, 132

L
Leaving home, 66–68
Legend, 6

M
Methodology, 1, 12–15, 20–22, 35–36, 83–84, 167–172
  author/data, 169–170
  author/narrative, 170–171
  author/subject, 168–169
  catalytic validity, 15
  construct validity, 15
  narrative structures, 167–171
  theory and action (praxis), 171–172
  triangulation, 15
Minorities, 10–11

N
Navajo Community College, 115

O
Ontological, 1, 26
Organizations, 26–31, 86–89, 94–113, 159
  organizational context, 94–113
  organizational culture, 159
  organizational enactment, 122–126
  organizational stratification, 86–89
  organizational theory, 26–31

P
Patchwork University, 99–105
Pedagogy, 160–161
  border pedagogy, 40–41
  critical pedagogy, 128–131
Persistence, 9, 17–25, 45–50
Pluralism, 52
Politics of difference, 143–148
Positivism, 13
Power, 14, 29, 37–40, 138–150
  powerlessness, 135, 138–150
Processual analysis, 14

Q
Qualitative research, 35–36, 167–172
Quantitative, 36

R
Recruitment, 18–20
Reservation, 58–59, 119–126
Residence status, 21
Retention, 17–25, 45–50
Rituals of integration, 45–50
Rituals of passage, 23
Rituals of transition, 45–47

S
Sink or Swim University, 94–99
Social class, 81–82
Social constructivism, 60
Social integration, 22–25, 45–50
Social transformation, 148–150
Socioeconomic background, 89
Study habits, 20–21
Suicide, 23
Symbolic violence, 38
Systemic, 36

T
Tracking, 17
Traditional Black institutions (TBI), 118
Transformative intellectualism, 151
Transformative leadership, 151
Tribal colleges, 86–87, 115–134, 153–156
Tribal culture, 122–126
Tribal influences, 60–64
Tribally Controlled Community College Assistance Act, 116